

1981

# An Evaluation of the Louisiana State University School of Music Doctoral Degree Program: a Follow-Up Study of Its Doctoral Graduates.

Donzell Lee

*Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_disstheses](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses)

---

## Recommended Citation

Lee, Donzell, "An Evaluation of the Louisiana State University School of Music Doctoral Degree Program: a Follow-Up Study of Its Doctoral Graduates." (1981). *LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses*. 3692.  
[https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_disstheses/3692](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/3692)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [gradetd@lsu.edu](mailto:gradetd@lsu.edu).

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted you will find a target note listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB RD., ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

8207831

Lee, Donzell

AN EVALUATION OF THE LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF  
MUSIC DOCTORAL DEGREE PROGRAM: A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF ITS  
DOCTORAL GRADUATES

*The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical Col.*    PH.D. 1981

University  
Microfilms  
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

AN EVALUATION OF THE LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF MUSIC DOCTORAL DEGREE PROGRAM:  
A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF ITS  
DOCTORAL GRADUATES

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Louisiana State University and  
Agricultural and Mechanical College  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The School of Music

by  
Donzell Lee  
B.Mus., Xavier University, 1972  
A.M., Stanford University, 1974  
December 1981

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere thanks to Dr. Robert F. Shambaugh for his guidance and encouragement during the research and writing of this report. Thanks are also due to Dr. Sam Adams for his suggestions on data analysis and to Mrs. Beulah Clark for her assistance in the computer programming and tabulation of the data.

The author is grateful for the suggestions made by Professor Paul Abel, Dr. Wallace McKenzie, Dr. Lyle Merriman, and Dr. John Raush.

The author is also deeply grateful to his wife, Connie, for her patience and encouragement. Sincere thanks are due to Mr. and Mrs. Lee Grant Jacobs and Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Smith for their continued support during work toward the degree.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
ABSTRACT . . . . .	viii
 CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Topic Researched . . . . .	3
Significance of the Topic . . . . .	3
Method of Investigation . . . . .	4
Development of the Remainder of the Report . . . . .	5
II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	7
Undergraduate Degree Program Studies . . . . .	7
Studies on Graduate Education in America . . . . .	13
Studies of Doctoral Music Programs . . . . .	19
III METHODS AND PROCEDURES AND PRESENTATION OF THE DATA . . . . .	22
Methods and Procedures . . . . .	22
Development of the Questionnaire . . . . .	22
Distribution of the Questionnaire . . . . .	25
Data Analysis . . . . .	26
The Data . . . . .	28
Presentation of the Data . . . . .	29
Academic and Biographical Data . . . . .	29
Vital Statistics . . . . .	29
Degree Types . . . . .	30
Post-Doctoral Study . . . . .	31
Occupational Data . . . . .	33
First Position Since the Doctorate . . . . .	34
Graduate Teaching Responsibilities . . . . .	36
Activity in Curriculum Development . . . . .	36
Professional Affiliations . . . . .	36
Publication . . . . .	38
Correspondence with LSU . . . . .	38
Reasons for Seeking the Doctorate . . . . .	39
Reasons for Choosing LSU . . . . .	39
Duration of Study . . . . .	41
Foreign Language . . . . .	44
Means of Financial Support . . . . .	44

CHAPTER	Page
Evaluation of Doctoral Study . . . . .	45
Familiarity with Course Offerings . . . . .	45
Opinions on the Number of Required Courses . . . . .	48
Sufficiency of Course Offerings . . . . .	55
Frequency of Course Offerings . . . . .	61
Selection of Dissertation Topic . . . . .	64
Work on Dissertation . . . . .	64
The Dissertation Experience . . . . .	68
Morale During Doctoral Study . . . . .	68
Methods of Evaluation . . . . .	70
Overall Quality of Instruction . . . . .	70
Music Library . . . . .	76
Physical Facilities . . . . .	80
Importance of Musical Acoustics . . . . .	80
Importance of Foreign Language . . . . .	80
Quality of Graduate Music Faculty . . . . .	81
Quality of the Doctoral Program . . . . .	84
Curriculum Objectives . . . . .	86
Suggestions for Improvement . . . . .	90
Advising . . . . .	90
Course Requirements and Course Offerings . . . . .	91
Dissertation . . . . .	92
Grading . . . . .	92
Placement Examinations . . . . .	93
Qualifying and General Examinations . . . . .	93
Final Examination . . . . .	93
Physical Facilities . . . . .	94
IV SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	95
Introduction . . . . .	95
Summary and Conclusions . . . . .	95
Recommendations . . . . .	101
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	103
APPENDICES . . . . .	108
APPENDIX A: COVER LETTER, INTRODUCTORY LETTER, AND QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	109
APPENDIX B: COMMENTS CONCERNING ADVISING . . . . .	134
APPENDIX C: COMMENTS CONCERNING COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND COURSE OFFERINGS . . . . .	141
APPENDIX D: COMMENTS CONCERNING THE DISSERTATION EXPERIENCE . . . . .	151
APPENDIX E: COMMENTS CONCERNING THE GRADING SYSTEM . . . . .	159
APPENDIX F: COMMENTS CONCERNING PLACEMENT EXAMINATIONS . . . . .	164
APPENDIX G: COMMENTS CONCERNING QUALIFYING AND GENERAL EXAMINATIONS . . . . .	170

	Page
APPENDIX H: COMMENTS CONCERNING THE FINAL EXAMINATION . . .	177
APPENDIX I: COMMENTS CONCERNING PHYSICAL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT . . . . .	183
APPENDIX J: MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS . . . . .	190
APPENDIX K: OBJECTIVES OF GRADUATE STUDY ACCORDING TO RESPONSE TYPE . . . . .	195
APPENDIX L: ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH LSU DOCTORAL GRADUATES HOLD MEMBERSHIP . . . . .	202
VITA . . . . .	204



# LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Respondents by area of concentration and period during which degree was conferred . . . . .	27
2	Institutions from which respondents received their master's degree . . . . .	32
3	Extent of responsibilities on first music job since the doctorate . . . . .	35
4	Respondents who have taught graduate level courses . .	37
5	Reasons for attending LSU . . . . .	40
6	Consistency of effort in completion of the degree . . .	42
7	Amount of time needed to complete the degree . . . . .	43
8	Means of financial support during doctoral study . . .	46
9	Familiarity with course offerings at time of enrollment in doctoral program . . . . .	47
10	Respondents' opinions of the number of required music education courses . . . . .	49
11	Respondents' opinions of the number of required music history courses . . . . .	51
12	Respondents' opinions of the number of required music theory courses . . . . .	52
13	Respondents' opinions of the number of required composition courses . . . . .	53
14	Respondents' opinions of the number of required performance courses . . . . .	54
15	Respondents' satisfaction with music history courses available . . . . .	56
16	Respondents' satisfaction with composition courses available . . . . .	58

TABLE		Page
17	Respondents' satisfaction with performance courses available . . . . .	59
18	Respondents' satisfaction with music education course offerings . . . . .	60
19	Respondents' satisfaction with music theory course offerings . . . . .	62
20	Respondents' opinion of whether required courses were included in the schedule often enough . . . . .	63
21	Selection of dissertation topic . . . . .	65
22	Percentage of dissertation completed while in residence at the university . . . . .	67
23	Respondents' opinions of the dissertation experience .	69
24	Respondents' opinions on the importance of various methods of evaluation . . . . .	71
25	Respondents' opinions of the sufficiency of the course work challenge . . . . .	73
26	Respondents' opinions of whether course work gave exposure to current trends . . . . .	74
27	Respondents' opinions of whether course work provided an opportunity for practical application or testing of ideas presented . . . . .	77
28	Respondents' opinions of whether the music library provided a congenial atmosphere for research and study	78
29	Respondents' opinions of the importance of the required foreign language . . . . .	82
30	Respondents' opinions of the quality of the graduate faculty . . . . .	83
31	Respondents' opinions of the overall quality of the doctoral music program . . . . .	87

## ABSTRACT

In August 1967, the first doctoral degree in music at Louisiana State University was conferred. Between August 1967 and May 1981, the doctoral degree program in the School of Music at LSU has shown considerable growth, in both number of degrees awarded and curricular offerings.

The focus of this study was the evaluation, in terms of quality and effectiveness, of the doctoral music degree program at LSU through an analysis of the responses of its doctoral graduates. A questionnaire was mailed to all sixty-four doctoral degree recipients. Fifty-eight (90.6%) returned usable questionnaires for the study.

Items included in the questionnaire were designed to provide information in several categories: 1) employment record, 2) professional activities and affiliations, 3) length of enrollment, 4) program design, 5) course offerings, 6) quality of instruction, 7) grading, 8) the dissertation experience, and 9) physical facilities. In addition, the graduates were requested to provide suggestions for improvement in such categories as advising, course requirements, course offering, grading, examinations, and physical facilities.

Among the major findings of the study were

1. Most respondents were employed as instructors or administrators in music at the college or university level.

2. While all respondents were active members of at least two professional organizations or societies, not many respondents were active in the publication of articles, books, or recordings.

3. The average time required to complete the degree was 5.3 years.

4. Most respondents were satisfied with course requirements and course offerings during their period of study. There was, however, some indication of a desire for more specification of subject matter in terms of course offerings.

5. Most respondents described the dissertation experience as intellectually enlightening.

6. Most respondents were of the opinion that both the quality of the music faculty and the quality of the doctoral music program were good.

7. The graduates overwhelmingly agreed that improvements were needed in the physical facilities.

8. Examinations were deemed to be thorough and fair by most respondents.

9. Advising in the School of Music was considered very strong.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Perhaps since its inception, graduate education in America has been faced with numerous problems and challenges relative to its directions and goals. Inevitably, graduate schools everywhere must consider and address the many educational, economic, political, social, and technological developments which, either directly or indirectly, effect the totality of the academic environment. With the advent of new developments, there has historically been, in the best graduate schools, a concomitant concern for the maintenance of quality and high academic standards. Administrators, faculty, and students as well, must necessarily be concerned about the perpetuation of high standards and uncompromising quality at the doctoral level.

Graduate study leading toward the Doctor of Philosophy degree was begun in the United States during the nineteenth century. Yale University awarded the first Ph.D. degree in 1861. In his investigation of the rise of graduate education in America, Everett Walters pointed out that the requirements for this first American Ph.D. called for two years of postbaccalaureate study, a final examination, a thesis, and an acquaintance with Latin and Greek.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Everett Walters, ed., Graduate Education Today (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965), p. 2.

The first Doctor of Philosophy degree in music awarded in the United States was conferred by Harvard University in 1905. The area of concentration was theory and musicology.<sup>2</sup>

A description of the Doctor of Philosophy degree in music at LSU first appeared in the 1966-68 issue of the LSU Graduate School Catalog.<sup>3</sup> Initially, the Ph.D. degree was offered with majors in Music History and Literature or Music Education. In the 1972-73 issue of the LSU Graduate School Catalog, the Doctor of Musical Arts degree was listed as a professional degree offered by the University, with possible concentrations in Composition or Performance.<sup>4</sup> In the same issue, Music Theory was listed as an area of concentration for the Ph.D. degree.

Since its inception in 1966, the doctoral program in music at LSU has shown continuous growth in the number of students enrolled. The first degree was awarded in August 1967. A total of sixty-four doctoral degrees were conferred between August 1967 and May 1981. During this approximately fifteen-year period, eighteen degrees were conferred between 1967 and 1973, and forty-four degrees were conferred between 1974 and 1980. In view of the significant growth in

---

<sup>2</sup>Harvard University, Doctors of Philosophy and Doctors of Science of Harvard University, 1873-1926 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926), p. 157.

<sup>3</sup>Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, LSU Graduate School Catalog (Baton Rouge: LSU Publication, 1966), p. 150.

<sup>4</sup>Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, LSU Graduate School Catalog (Baton Rouge: LSU Publication, 1972), p. 140.

terms of quantity, it is interesting to note that no significant research has been done to address problems of quality and effectiveness.

#### Statement of the Topic Researched

The focus of this study was the evaluation of the doctoral music degree program through an analysis of responses gathered from its doctoral graduates. The report concentrated on three broad categories:

- I. Biographic and Academic Information
  - A. Employment record
  - B. Professional activities and affiliations
  - C. Length of enrollment
- II. Evaluation of Study
  - A. Program design
  - B. Course offerings
  - C. Quality of instruction
  - D. Grading
  - E. Dissertation
  - F. Physical facilities
  - G. Rating of objectives of graduate education
- III. Suggestions for Improvement
  - A. Advising
  - B. Course requirements
  - C. Course offerings
  - D. Grading
  - E. Examinations
  - F. Physical facilities

#### Significance of the Topic

It is imperative that systematic planning and preparation be adhered to in order to perpetuate high quality in the curriculum.

Mayhew and Ford wrote:

Planning also must consider such factors as obsolescence of knowledge and such concepts as the half-life of a curriculum--that time during which half of the content has been replaced by newer knowledge and concepts. Because of the exponential increase in relevant information, the half-life of a number of professional curricula is now about five years. One can argue that as the half-life of a curriculum is approached, major curricular overhaul is needed.<sup>5</sup>

Heiss reinforced the idea of systematic examination of program offerings in graduate schools in her book, Challenges To Graduate Schools:

Curriculum revision, reform, or innovation should be systematic, involve the careful deliberation of the best minds, and be pursued under conditions which remove the constraints imposed by time schedules, fatigue or other interfering commitments.<sup>6</sup>

The practical application of a study such as the one presented here is quite feasible. The factual information provided by the degree recipients, as well as their opinions of the various programs of study, can provide important information to those who may be considering changes in the curriculum.

#### Method of Investigation

The collection of data for the topic researched was accomplished by the use of a questionnaire. The basic format and content of the questionnaire were developed from instruments used in previous

---

<sup>5</sup>Lewis B. Mayhew and Patrick F. Ford, Reform In Graduate and Professional Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974), p. 82.

<sup>6</sup>Ann M. Heiss, Challenges to Graduate Schools (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1970), p. 277.



studies of graduate education, such as the study done by the American Council on Education.<sup>7</sup> Dissertations which made use of questionnaires concerning graduate study were studied for ideas on content and format. Additionally, Oppenheim's work on the subject of developing the questionnaire was used.<sup>8</sup>

The questionnaire, which contained both open-ended and closed-ended items, was mailed to each degree recipient whose degree was conferred by the end of the spring semester of 1981. A sample of the population for the study was asked to complete the questionnaire and to provide suggestions for improvement of the instrument.

The responses from the returned questionnaires were statistically analyzed according to the following list of variables:

1. 1967-1971 degree recipients
2. 1972-1976 degree recipients
3. 1977-1981 degree recipients
4. Composition majors
5. Music Education majors
6. Music History/Theory majors
7. Performance majors

The analyses were based on the computation of simple frequencies and percentages. For items which made use of rating scales, a mean rating was computed.

#### Development of the Remainder of the Report

The following is an outline of the remainder of the report:

---

<sup>7</sup>Kenneth D. Roose and Charles J. Anderson, A Rating of Graduate Programs (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970), p. 109.

<sup>8</sup>A. N. Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966).

Chapter II	Review of Related Literature
Chapter III	Methods and Procedures and Presentation of the Data
Chapter IV	Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations
Bibliography	
Appendices	

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The questionnaire, as an evaluative instrument, has been copiously incorporated in numerous studies pertaining to higher education. In research reviewed for this study, the questionnaire was used in a variety of studies aimed at determining quality and effectiveness of undergraduate as well as graduate degree programs in music.

A wealth of studies on undergraduate degree programs were investigated. These studies, which include some of the earliest studies on the quality and effectiveness of music programs in higher education, constitute the greatest number of studies cited in this chapter. Several studies on graduate education in general, because of their profundity, were also included in this review of related literature. The final section of this chapter enumerates findings and recommendations of studies germane to the doctoral degree in music.

#### Undergraduate Degree Program Studies

One of the earliest studies investigated was an exhaustive survey of music education by McEachern.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of this study

---

<sup>1</sup>Edna McEachern, A Survey and Evaluation of the Education of School Music Teachers in the United States (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937).

was to make a critical analysis of how school music teachers were trained. The method of evaluation was two-fold: (1) by criteria validated by thirty-two superior educators of school music, and (2) by professional needs as determined by 370 school music teachers. A total of 150 school music department heads from thirty-nine states provided data for this study. From the data gathered, McEachern made suggestions for changes and modifications of existing programs. A detailed four-year curriculum for the education of school music teachers was devised.

The McEachern study set the standard for several other multi-institution studies. In 1966, Lee endeavored to describe the influence of the accrediting movement on curriculum change and development during the years 1955-1965.<sup>2</sup> A questionnaire was sent to twenty-four schools selected by the Music Educators National Conference and the National Association of Schools of Music. The returned data revealed that relatively few curriculum changes had taken place between 1955 and 1965.

Studies by Clinton<sup>3</sup> and Smith<sup>4</sup> were attempts to evaluate undergraduate music programs, on a state-wide basis, in Texas and

---

<sup>2</sup>Cecil L. Lee, "Developing Patterns of The Undergraduate Music Education Curriculum in the United States" (Ph.D. dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1966).

<sup>3</sup>Robert L. Clinton, "An Evaluative Study of the Effectiveness of the Music Education Programs in Texas Colleges" (Ed.D. dissertation, Texas Technological College, 1962).

<sup>4</sup>Estus Smith, "A Critical Study of Junior College Music Programs in the State of Mississippi" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1970).

Mississippi, respectively. Clinton's study focused on the opinions of recent music education graduates, supervisors, and other music administrators. Smith, in addition to making use of a questionnaire, obtained data by conducting personal interviews with junior college instructors, senior college music chairmen, and administrative personnel. The aim of this survey was to point out apparent curricula weaknesses.

Leman solicited the opinions of administrators, faculty, and students in an investigation of the undergraduate music education program for the preparation of choral directors at five Midwestern universities.<sup>5</sup> The study focused on admission requirements, curricular requirements and options, recital requirements, student teaching requirements, evaluation of and by students, facilities, and equipment available for student use.

In order to determine the nature and quality of music education in Lutheran-related colleges in the United States, Williams examined school bulletins, conducted interviews, and made use of a questionnaire in his research.<sup>6</sup> Using National Association of Schools

---

<sup>5</sup>John W. Leman, "A Descriptive Study of the Undergraduate Music Education Program For the Preparation of Choral Directors At Five Midwestern Universities During the 1972-73 School Year" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1974).

<sup>6</sup>Frank M. Williams, "A Survey-Appraisal of the Music Curricula of Liberal Arts Colleges Related to the Lutheran Church in America" (Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1969).

of Music criteria, Williams studied preparatory requirements, entrance requirements, and required general studies.

During the period from 1955 to 1959, studies of Baird,<sup>7</sup> Humphreys,<sup>8</sup> Worrell,<sup>9</sup> Wilson,<sup>10</sup> Whitlock,<sup>11</sup> and Turner,<sup>12</sup> were primarily concerned with the evaluation of undergraduate music at individual institutions. In general, these studies attempted to discover required skills for effective teaching and to determine how well students were prepared during their study of music at the undergraduate level. The study by Worrell was unique in that it compared the alumni's rating of competencies with the faculty's rating of the same competencies.

---

<sup>7</sup>Forrest Baird, "A Follow-Up Inquiry of Secondary School Music Teachers Prepared at San Jose State College" (Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1955).

<sup>8</sup>Alfred W. Humphreys, "Follow-Up Study of the Graduates of the School of Music of the University of Illinois" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1955).

<sup>9</sup>John W. Worrell, "An Evaluation of Teacher Preparation in Music Education at the University of Kentucky through an Analysis of the Opinions of Graduates" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1957).

<sup>10</sup>George Wilson, "A Study of Professional and Music Education at the Ohio State University" (Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1958).

<sup>11</sup>John Bert Whitlock, "A Study of the Music Education Program at the State University of Iowa During the Academic Years 1955-57" (Ph.D. dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1958).

<sup>12</sup>William M. Turner, "A Follow-Up Study of Music Education at North Texas State College" (Ed.D. dissertation, North Texas State College, 1959).

Similar studies were completed during the period from 1960 to 1969 by Stoll,<sup>13</sup> Mathis,<sup>14</sup> Darnall,<sup>15</sup> Woodard,<sup>16</sup> Laxon,<sup>17</sup> and Finley.<sup>18</sup> The basic thrust of each of these studies was an evaluation of undergraduate music in which the opinions of students were emphasized. The studies done by Stoll, Woodard, and Finley, included survey questionnaires directed to public school administrators, critic teachers, and music supervisors. Woodard initiated a novel approach in his study of undergraduate music at the University of Colorado. Questionnaires were sent to 1945 and 1955 graduates and their supervisors. With this data, an effort was made to predict the

---

<sup>13</sup>Forrest Stoll, "An Evaluation of the Music Education Curriculum at the University of Utah, with Recommendations for Future Development" (Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1960).

<sup>14</sup>George Russell Mathis, "A Study of Music Teacher Preparation at Illinois Wesleyan University" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1962).

<sup>15</sup>Josiah Darnall, "An Evaluation of the Bachelor of Music Education Curriculum at Murray State College Through an Analysis of the Opinions of its Teaching Graduates" (Mus.Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1963).

<sup>16</sup>Clair Woodard, "An Investigation of Music Education at the University of Colorado Including a Follow-Up of Graduates" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1963).

<sup>17</sup>Charles R. Laxon, "An Analysis of the Opinions of Selected Chico State College Graduates Regarding the Adequacy of Their Preparation to Teach Music" (Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1966).

<sup>18</sup>John T. Finley, "A Follow-Up Study of the Elementary and Secondary School Music Teachers Prepared at Jacksonville State University from 1956 Through 1968 Through a Survey of Graduates' Opinions, College Grades, Employers' Evaluation, and Pre-College Experience" (Ed.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1969).

effectiveness of the 1958-1960 curriculum in music education at the University of Colorado.

Choate investigated the undergraduate music education curriculum at Louisiana State University.<sup>19</sup> Questionnaires were sent to 1965-1974 graduates in an effort to determine the music teaching competencies considered most essential for teaching, the importance placed on these competencies, and the extent of effectiveness of the undergraduate preparation of these competencies. A second questionnaire was sent to the principals and music supervisors with whom these graduates worked in order to obtain ratings of the graduates.

Gilchrist<sup>20</sup> and Thomas<sup>21</sup> provided the most recent studies of undergraduate music degree programs. Only vocal teachers were surveyed in the Gilchrist study. He attempted to evaluate vocal music teachers' skill in teaching gospel music. Analysis of the data obtained from sixty questionnaires and personal interviews with ten

---

<sup>19</sup>James F. Choate, Jr., "An Analysis of the Undergraduate Curriculum and the Subsequent Professional Involvement of Selected Instrumental Music Education Graduates of Louisiana State University" (Ed.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1976).

<sup>20</sup>Charles H. Gilchrist, "An Assessment of the Preparation of North Carolina Public School Music Teachers in Performance Practices of Black Gospel Music: Implications for Curriculum Revisions in Higher Education" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1980).

<sup>21</sup>Robert Thomas, "An Evaluation of the Music Education Program at Claflin College" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1981).



of these respondents enabled Gilchrist to determine the frequency of use of gospel music in selected high school choral programs. He was able to make further recommendations concerning the possibility of including courses relative to gospel music in the curriculum of North Carolina institutions of higher education. The study by Thomas was essentially an attempt to discover the strengths and weaknesses of the music education program. Graduates were asked to rate the importance of sixty-six objectives of teacher preparation in terms of the importance of the objective in the graduate's present work and the adequacy of preparation at Claflin College.

#### Studies on Graduate Education in America

One of the most authoritative studies of graduate education in America was done by Berelson.<sup>22</sup> This two-year study, which was begun in the fall of 1957, was concerned with the first century of graduate work in this country. The study was divided into three sections. The first section focused on the historical perspective of graduate education in America. The second section of the study dealt with the state of graduate education as observed by Berelson during the period of his research. This section of the study dealt with such topics as the training of college teachers, administration and organization of graduate schools, the duration of doctoral study, the

---

<sup>22</sup>Bernard Berelson, Graduate Education in the United States (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960).

dissertation, the foreign language requirement, and examinations. The third section contained conclusions, commentaries, and recommendations.

Berelson designed a comprehensive set of questionnaires which he sent to five groups: graduate deans, graduate faculty, recent recipients of the doctorate, college presidents, and representatives of industrial firms which employed large numbers of doctorates. The questionnaires were sent to ninety-two deans, 4,440 members of the graduate faculties in the same ninety-two institutions, 3,843 recipients of the doctorate in 1957, 856 presidents of independent liberal arts colleges and teachers colleges, and 191 industrial companies. The following returns were achieved for the study: deans, 79 (86%); faculty, 1,821 (41%); college presidents, 609 (71%); industrial companies, 70 (37%).

Berelson concluded that, by and large, the graduate schools were doing a reasonably good job. The following recommendations were made as a result of the analysis of the data:

1. The norm of a four-year doctorate should be enforced by the universities.
2. The program for doctoral training should be a clearer, more compact, more specified program of study including more supervision and direction by the faculty.
3. The dissertation should be shorter.
4. Post-doctoral work should be regularized.
5. The foreign language requirement should be left to the departments.
6. The final oral examination as a defense of the dissertation should be eliminated in those institutions where it is now mainly a form, and a substitute ceremonial event put in its place.
7. The support of doctoral students should be regularized and they should be expected to pay more of their own way.

8. Recruiting for doctoral study should be conducted more systematically and more energetically.

9. The writing deficiencies at the graduate level should be attacked directly.

10. Informal social centers for graduate students should be set up on the campuses where they do not now exist.

11. All doctoral candidates should have some actual teaching experience as part of their doctoral requirements.

12. The graduate school should set up a course or seminar (without credit) on the character of the liberal arts college and its problems, for those doctoral students interested in teaching at the college level.

13. A new, two-year intermediate degree for college teaching hopefuls might be initiated.

14. The national load of doctoral study should be carried mainly by the presently established institutions of top and middle-level prestige.

15. The office of the graduate dean should be strengthened.

16. The graduate faculty, by discipline and by institution, should systematically review a range of questions involved in their graduate programs. Among the issues to be discussed should be:

- a. Conception and purpose of the doctorate.
- b. Undergraduate preparation, and the articulation of graduate and undergraduate work.
- c. Training in teaching.
- d. The duration of the doctorate and the problem of attrition.
- e. The character and length of the dissertation.
- f. The foreign language requirement.
- g. The final oral examination.<sup>23</sup>

In 1961, Carmichael<sup>24</sup> published a study which was somewhat less complimentary than the study done by Berelson. Following the completion of his two-year study in which data were collected from college presidents, graduate deans, department heads, registrars, and faculty members, Carmichael concluded that the critical problems of

---

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., pp. 234-254.

<sup>24</sup>Oliver C. Carmichael, Graduate Education: A Critique and a Program (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961).

graduate education could not be solved without reorganization. He not only addressed many problems relative to the doctoral degree program, but he also made specific suggestions for the master's degree which called for a very close coordination with the final two college years for those deemed capable of graduate work. The following recommendations were made as a result of his investigation:

1. Each graduate school should have at least a small full-time faculty responsible to the dean of the school, who would have a budget sufficient not only for his full-time staff but for part-time faculty.

2. The dean and his full-time colleagues would be responsible for revising the doctoral program to the end that an able student could plan his graduate work with the certainty it could be completed within a specified time.

3. Pregraduate programs should be encouraged in the colleges.

4. A special committee of graduate faculty members should be formed to address the special problems of students who plan to enter college teaching.

5. A three-year master's degree plan should become the gateway to the doctorate.<sup>25</sup>

Heiss surveyed graduate deans, academic deans, department chairmen, graduate faculty, and students who were currently enrolled in doctoral programs at ten major universities.<sup>26</sup> Through the use of questionnaires and by conducting personal interviews, she investigated the following areas: (1) organization of graduate schools, (2) the role of deans and department chairmen, (3) the process through

---

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., pp. 199-201.

<sup>26</sup>Ann M. Heiss, Challenges to Graduate Schools (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970).

which the curriculum was reviewed, (4) the mechanism through which interrelationships were implemented, and (5) anticipated academic changes.

Questionnaires were mailed to 2,308 faculty members. A total of 1,610 was returned. Of the 4,806 questionnaires mailed to students, 3,487 (72%) were returned. Based on the data collected, Heiss made numerous recommendations. Among the salient recommendations included in the report were:

1. University resources, programs, and policies should be organized so as to create an environment which focuses more on learning than on teaching.

2. Schools should not allow the academic program or the process of becoming a specialist in a particular discipline to become dehumanized in the interest of developing the discipline.

3. Academic reform should include changes in the organization of instructional units and in the introduction of more diversified methods of transmitting knowledge.

4. To extend the scholarly dialogue and reduce the distance between faculty member and student, informal learning space should be made accessible.

5. In planning Ph.D. programs, careful consideration should be given to preparing graduates for the future.

6. At the Ph.D. level, programs of study should be individualized to the particular needs of the student, and the student, as an investor, should be involved in its design.

7. The orientation and advising of doctoral students should be systematically thorough and offered on both a formal and informal basis.

8. The structure of Ph.D. programs should liberate the student from a preoccupation with grades, credits, course examinations, and similar constraints which replicate his undergraduate role and experiences.

9. The purpose and responsibilities of the research assistantship should be clearly defined.

10. Teaching should be reinstated as a primary purpose and responsibility of the university.

11. The graduate school should offer carefully designed programs of teacher preparation for doctoral students who plan to enter academic careers.

12. Graduate schools should give serious consideration to a special degree for college teaching.

13. Universities should improve their articulation with undergraduate institutions, especially with regard to their curriculum changes.

14. A seminar on the American college and university should be available and recommended for all Ph.D. students who plan to enter academic careers.

15. Doctoral study should be conducted mainly by those institutions that are already approved for this responsibility.

16. A national policy board on graduate education should be organized.<sup>27</sup>

The American Council on Education published studies by Cartter<sup>28</sup> in 1964 and by Roose and Andersen<sup>29</sup> in 1970, which were concerned with rating doctoral programs in terms of quality. Cartter collected data from 4,008 faculty members, who represented some twenty-nine disciplines at 106 major institutions of higher education. Each discipline was rated according to the quality of the graduate faculty and according to the effectiveness of the doctoral program. The leading institutions were listed by rank order under these two categories.

The study by Roose and Andersen was essentially a replication of the Cartter study. Of the 8,100 questionnaires mailed, 6,325 were returned. Rankings were compared with those found in the Cartter

---

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., pp. 274-301.

<sup>28</sup>Allan M. Cartter, An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966).

<sup>29</sup>Kenneth D. Roose and Charles J. Andersen, A Rating of Graduate Programs (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970).

study. Of particular interest to this research was the inclusion of music as one of the disciplines studied. The leading music schools, by rated quality of graduate faculty, included Harvard, California (Berkeley), Princeton, Yale, Chicago, Illinois, Michigan, New York University, Columbia, California (Los Angeles), Cornell, Stanford, Indiana, North Carolina, Rochester, Brandeis, and Southern California.<sup>30</sup> Leading institutions, by rated effectiveness of doctoral program, included essentially the same schools.

#### Studies of Doctoral Music Programs

A non-evaluative study concerned with the emergence of American terminal degrees in music was done in 1955 by Kennedy.<sup>31</sup> The study focused on defining the doctoral degrees in music which were available at that time. The major findings submitted by Kennedy were:

1. Forty institutions offered doctoral degrees in music.
2. Public or private support had little to do with curriculum and philosophy.
3. Non-music offices usually administered the degree.
4. Degree names varied significantly.
5. Fields of concentration included musicology, composition, music education, applied, psychology, and church music.
6. Admission requirements varied greatly.
7. Thirty institutions used the semester plan while ten used the quarter plan of attendance.
8. Research tools requirements formed the most controversial issue encountered through interviews.

---

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 48.

<sup>31</sup>Arthur Ward Kennedy, "The Doctoral Degree in Music in Universities and Colleges of the United States" (Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1955).

9. Admissions, qualifying, and final examinations were consistently found to be the usual examination requirements.

10. Total hours required for the degree varied greatly.<sup>32</sup>

In 1968, Prince completed a study on the graduate music education programs at the University of Illinois.<sup>33</sup> Prince sought to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the graduate programs in music education at both the master's level and the doctoral level. The population for the study included 660 graduate degree recipients. The respondents were asked to consider fifty-five objectives of music teacher preparation. Each objective was to be rated according to its importance in the respondent's work and according to the adequacy of graduate preparation in the attainment of each objective. Analysis of the data resulted in the following implications for the graduate music education programs at the University of Illinois:

1. Additional or augmented opportunities for the study of methods and materials for the various facets of music education should be made available.
2. Knowledge of theory and history as it relates to performance and teaching should be nurtured.
3. Expanded opportunities for music research and understanding its role in education should be made available.
4. Ensemble performance opportunities should be expanded and encouraged.
5. Attention should be given to more intense advising and counseling.
6. More emphasis should be placed on the acquisition of skills and techniques of handling audio-visual aids.

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., pp. 167-69.

<sup>33</sup>Joe Norman Prince, "An Evaluation of Graduate Music Education Programs at the University of Illinois" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1968).



7. Physical facilities should be improved.<sup>34</sup>

The one study reviewed by this writer in which all areas of the doctoral program were investigated was done by Bunch in 1969.<sup>35</sup> Data were compiled from the 89.3% of the doctoral graduates from the University of Iowa who responded to a questionnaire mailed by Bunch. The questionnaire was divided into four main sections: (1) demographic data, (2) duration of program, (3) evaluation of doctoral work, and (4) criticisms and reforms. Bunch's findings included:

1. Respondents felt that the traditional grading system should be retained.
2. A small majority indicated that certain aspects of the doctoral study was a repetition of previous work.
3. There was insufficient emphasis placed on college teaching.
4. Students should be allowed to do more independent work.
5. Course work should be worked out by both the student and the advisor on an individual basis.
6. High admission standards should be kept.
7. Doctoral music programs should not be so tightly structured.<sup>36</sup>

The studies mentioned in this chapter provided helpful ideas on content and format for the questionnaire used in this study. The Berelson study was especially helpful in terms of content. It was found to contain the most extensively developed questionnaires of all the studies.

---

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., pp. 244-245.

<sup>35</sup>William Franklin Bunch, "An Evaluation of the Ph.D. Curriculum in Music at the University of Iowa from 1931 to 1967 through an Analysis of the Opinions of its Doctoral Graduates" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1969).

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., pp. 284-346.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS AND PROCEDURES AND PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

#### Methods and Procedures

##### Development of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire used for the collection of data for this study was designed during the fall and spring semesters of the 1980-81 academic year. Oppenheim's work,<sup>37</sup> previously cited in Chapter One of this report was the primary source consulted in the development of the questionnaire. The chapters which dealt with question-wording, checklists, rating scales, and attitude scaling methods were particularly beneficial.

During the fall of 1980, several presentations pertaining to format and content of the questionnaire were made in a graduate music education seminar at LSU. Participants in the seminar offered many interesting ideas, some of which were made use of in the further development of the questionnaire.

In March 1981, the Advanced Educational Statistics class at LSU examined the questionnaire and provided many helpful suggestions for reducing the size of the original instrument.

---

<sup>37</sup>Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement.

Many sources were consulted for ideas on content and format. The questionnaire designed by Berelson<sup>38</sup> were carefully studied. His questionnaire designed for student evaluation of graduate study served as a guide during the initial development of the questionnaire which was subsequently used in this study. The questionnaire used in the Roose and Andersen<sup>39</sup> study provided useful ideas on academic and biographical data.

One of the most helpful sources consulted was the Report of the MENC Commission on Graduate Music Teacher Education.<sup>40</sup> Criteria necessary for successful graduate music programs, as well as goals and objectives of graduate study in music were expounded.

Finally, the questionnaire was submitted to several members of the LSU School of Music faculty for comments and suggestions for refinement.

The questionnaire, in its final form, was divided into three main parts:

Part One: Academic and Biographical Data

Part Two: Evaluation of Doctoral Study

Part Three: Suggestions for Improvement

---

<sup>38</sup>Berelson, Graduate Education in the United States, pp. 322-31.

<sup>39</sup>Roose and Andersen, A Rating of Graduate Programs, pp. 110-11.

<sup>40</sup>Chuck Ball, "Report of the MENC Commission on Graduate Music Teacher Evaluation," Music Educators Journal, October 1980, pp. 46-53.

Part One contained twenty-four items which sought data relative to vital statistics, educational background, work experiences since the completion of the doctorate, professional activities and publications, and the means by which the graduate's doctoral study was financed. All items which made up this part of the questionnaire required objective responses. One item, directed to graduates who were not employed in music, requested elaboration on the reason for not being employed in music.

Part Two of the questionnaire was subdivided into two large sections. In the first section, the graduate was requested to give an appraisal of academic study at LSU by addressing such aspects of study as the usefulness of required courses, the degree of satisfaction with course offerings, the dissertation (monograph) experience, the foreign language requirement, the quality of academic instruction, the quality of the graduate faculty, and the grading system. Twenty-nine items were included in this section.

The second section of Part Two consisted of thirty-nine curriculum objectives of graduate study in music. Each objective required one response indicating the importance of the objective in the graduate's program of study, and a second response indicating the effectiveness of instruction in achieving the objective.

The final part of the questionnaire provided the graduate with the opportunity to make suggestions for improvement of the doctoral music program at LSU in the following areas: advising, course

requirements and course offerings, the dissertation experience, the grading system, examinations, and physical facilities.

#### Distribution of the Questionnaire

Prior to mailing the questionnaire to all of the graduates, it was submitted to four doctoral graduates and to one current graduate student who had completed the general examinations for pretesting. Phelps pointed out that it is useful to pretest a questionnaire on peers or on groups similar to the one whose responses would be sought for the study.<sup>41</sup> The respondents who participated in the pretest provided valuable information concerning clarity of the instrument as well as information on the amount of time required to complete all responses.

On April 20, 1981, the questionnaire was mailed to all sixty-two doctoral music graduates. Each questionnaire was accompanied by a letter of introduction from Dr. Lyle Merriman, dean of the School of Music. A cover letter was also included from this writer which explained the intent and significance of the study.

During the initial response period, thirty-six (58%) questionnaires were returned. On May 15, 1981, a follow-up letter was sent to those graduates who had not responded. (At that time, two additional questionnaires were assembled in order to include May 1981

---

<sup>41</sup>Roger P. Phelps, A Guide to Research to Music Education, 2nd ed. (Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1980), p. 218.

graduates in the study.) Approximately one month later a second copy of the questionnaire was mailed to the eight graduates who still had not responded.

By July 1, 1981, a total of fifty-nine (92%) had responded. Of this number, one returned questionnaire was deemed to be insufficiently complete for use in the study. Fifty-eight (90%) questionnaires were returned sufficiently complete for use in the study. According to Good, this percentage for questionnaire returns exceeds the minimum standard for a valid study.<sup>42</sup> Table 1 contains the data on the number of respondents.

#### Data Analysis

All responses were key-punched on IBM data cards and input to an IBM 360-4341 computer for analysis. Using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) software,<sup>43</sup> the responses were initially analyzed in terms of simple frequencies and percentages. A second analysis of the data was done with frequencies and percentages for selected items tabulated according to the areas of concentration of the respondents.

Finally, an analysis of the data was executed based on the period during which the respondent's degree was awarded. The approximately fifteen-year period during which doctoral music degrees have

---

<sup>42</sup>Carter V. Good, Essentials of Educational Research (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966), p. 226.

<sup>43</sup>Jane T. Helwig, ed., Statistical Analysis System, (Raleigh, N.C.: SAS Institute, Inc., 1979).

Table 1--Respondents by area of concentration and  
period during which degree was conferred

<u>Area</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
Composition	9	15.5
Music Education	18	31.0
Music History/Theory	12	20.7
Performance	19	32.8
	<u>58</u>	<u>100.0</u>

  

<u>Period</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>
1967-71	8	13.8
1972-76	24	41.4
1977-May 1981	26	44.8
	<u>58</u>	<u>100.0</u>

been awarded was divided into three smaller periods: 1) 1967-71, 2) 1972-76, 3) 1977-May 1981.

A mean response was computed for items 18.1-18.9 found in Part Two of the questionnaire. Likewise, a mean response was computed for the thirty-nine objectives of graduate study found at the end of Part Two of the questionnaire. In these sections Likert-type rating scales were used to indicate the graduate's response.

Because only one music theory graduate returned the questionnaire, the area of music theory was collapsed with that of music history.

#### The Data

The information included in this chapter was based on responses contained in the fifty-eight returned questionnaires. Because of the differences in individual programs of study, as well as differences in course requirements and course offerings within the various areas of concentration, each doctoral graduate did not necessarily respond to each item. For example, graduates whose program of study included no foreign language could not fairly respond to the item which dealt with foreign language requirements. Similarly, a music education graduate might not have been able to respond to some items which were addressed to the composition majors.

It should also be pointed out that there were some items which addressed specific areas of concentration to which graduates from all areas were permitted to respond.



## Presentation of the Data

### Academic and Biographical Data

#### Vital Statistics

Of the fifty-eight doctoral degree recipients whose responses were used in this study, forty-six (79.3%) were male while twelve (20.7%) were female. A 1978 National Academy of Sciences study indicated that the total number of doctoral degrees in music awarded between 1920 and 1974 was 3,386.<sup>44</sup> Of that total, 2,860 (84%) were male and 526 (16%) were female. Data found in this same study showed percentages of male and female doctoral recipients whose degrees were awarded during the period 1970-74 to be more compatible with the percentages found in the School of Music. Of the 1,394 doctoral degrees awarded in music from 1970-74, 1,127 (81%) were awarded to males, while 267 (19%) were awarded to females.<sup>45</sup> In a National Association of Schools of Music survey of doctoral degree granting institutions, the projected figure of students expected to graduate from doctoral degree programs in music during 1981 was 532.<sup>46</sup> The projected number of male recipients was 353 (66%), while the projected number of female recipients was 179 (34%).

---

<sup>44</sup>Lindsey R. Harmon, A Century of Doctorates, (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1978), p. 120.

<sup>45</sup>Timothy A. Rowe, ed. Music in Higher Education 1980-81 (Reston, VA: National Association of Schools of Music, 1981), p. 60.

<sup>46</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 60.

In terms of racial/ethnic identification of the doctoral graduates from the School of Music, almost all have been caucasians. Fifty-six (96.6%) of the respondents were caucasians, one (1.7%) was black, and one (1.7%) was Hispanic. Data found in a 1981 National Association of Schools of Music survey of doctoral degree granting institutions reveal the following figures for projected 1981 doctoral music graduates: 490 (92%) caucasian, twenty-six (5%) black, with the remaining sixteen (3%) graduates found among American Indian, Spanish surnamed, and oriental ethnic groups.<sup>47</sup> The previously mentioned National Academy of Sciences study reported the following information relative to the racial/ethnic identification of doctoral graduates:

Data on racial/ethnic composition of the doctorate recipients has only recently become available. It varies by field, and hence, to some extent, by sex. Overall, including U.S. and foreign citizens . . . 87.7 percent of recent Ph.D.'s are white, 3.4 percent are black, 0.5% are American Indian, 1 percent are Spanish Americans, Mexican Americans, or Chicanos, 0.2 percent are Puerto Ricans, and 7.2 percent are orientals.<sup>48</sup>

#### Degree Types

Among the respondents for this study, thirty-one (53.5%) received the Ph.D. degree while twenty-seven (46.5%) received the

---

<sup>47</sup>Ibid.

<sup>48</sup>Harmon, A Century of Doctorates, p. 76.

D.M.A. degree. These percentages are quite close to those found in the National Association of Schools of Music study mentioned above. The data on students expected to graduate from doctoral degree programs in music during 1981 show a projected 52.1% Ph.D. graduates, and a projected 47.9% D.M.A. graduates.<sup>49</sup>

LSU doctoral graduates received one of five types of master's degrees: 1) M.M., 2) M.A., 3) M.S., 4) M.M.Ed., 5) M.C.M. Forty-one (70.7%) received the M.M. degree. Five (8.6%) were awarded the M.A. degree. One (1.7%) graduate held the M.S. degree, while ten (17.3%) held the M.M.Ed. degree. Only one (1.7%) graduate held the M.C.M. degree.

These master's degrees were conferred by twenty-five different institutions of higher learning, most of which are located in the South or in the East. Table 2 shows that LSU ranked first in terms of the number of doctoral graduates who received their master's degrees from the list of institutions contained therein. Twenty-four (41%) respondents indicated that they had received the master's degree from LSU.

#### Post-doctoral Study

Traditionally the doctorate has been the highest academic degree awarded. Recent research has shown that substantial numbers of new doctoral recipients have undertaken post-doctoral study.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup>Rowe, Music in Higher Education 1980-81, p. 60.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

Table 2--Institutions from which respondents received  
their master's degree

Institution	Number of respondents	Percent of Total
LSU	24	41.4
Eastman School of Music	3	5.2
Northwestern State University (LA)	2	3.5
Indiana University	2	3.5
Florida State University	2	3.5
University of Alabama	2	3.5
Texas Technological University	2	3.5
Loyola University (LA)	2	3.5
North Texas State University	2	3.5
Northeast Louisiana University	2	3.5
Mills College	1	1.7
Southern Methodist University	1	1.7
Catholic University of America	1	1.7
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary	1	1.7
Michigan State University	1	1.7
Northwestern University	1	1.7
University of Maryland	1	1.7
New England Conservatory of Music	1	1.7
University of Michigan	1	1.7
University of Louisville	1	1.7
University of Southern California	1	1.7
Temple University	1	1.7
Columbia University	1	1.7
Mississippi State University	1	1.7
George Peabody College	1	1.7
	<u>58</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Ten (17.2%) LSU School of Music doctoral recipients have undertaken post-doctoral study.

Four graduates undertook post-doctoral study in performance. Two other graduates did post-doctoral study in composition and musicology. Three of the graduates indicated that they had undertaken study in non-music fields since the completion of the doctorate. One of these three, a performance major, chose to do study in the area of speech. The remaining two graduates both chose to undertake study in the area of business.

#### Occupational Data

The academic market has customarily provided extensive employment for new doctoral recipients. In recent years, because of the large number of new doctorates, the academic world has not been able to absorb the large number of doctoral recipients available for employment. Graduates of LSU's School of Music have fared fairly well in the academic job market. Forty-four (76%) respondents were employed as instructors of music either in higher education, secondary education, or elementary education. Another four (7%) were employed either in administrative positions in higher education or in a public school system. A total of forty-eight (83%) of the respondents were employed in the academic world.

Data found in the 1978 National Academy of Sciences study showed that from 1960 through 1974, 87.6% of the doctoral

recipients in the humanities fields were employed in the academic world.<sup>51</sup>

Six respondents indicated that they were employed as private music teachers. Two of the six were also involved in extensive performance careers.

Three other respondents were employed as church musicians. Thus a total of nine (16%) respondents were employed in non-academic jobs.

Only one respondent was unemployed.

#### First Position Since the Doctorate

Most respondents indicated that their first position since the doctorate was not limited to their specific area of concentration. Thirty-three (57%) respondents indicated that their major responsibilities included duties other than in their area of concentration. This was not the case, however, for the graduates grouped by area of concentration. Table 3 shows that half of the music education respondents held positions limited to their area of concentration. The data also show that since the inception of the doctoral degree program in music at LSU, the percentage of graduates with duties other than in their specific area of concentration has consistently declined from a high of 87.5% for the period 1967-71, to a low of 50% during the period 1977-May 1981.

---

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 156.

Table 3--Extent of responsibilities on first music  
job since the doctorate

Was your first position in music limited to your  
specific area of concentration?

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YES	3	33.3	9	50.0	3	25.0	9	47.4	24	41.4
NO	6	66.7	8	44.4	9	75.0	10	52.6	33	56.9
NA	0	0.0	1	5.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.7
Total	9	15.5	18	31.0	12	20.7	19	32.8	58	100.0

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YES	1	12.5	11	45.8	12	46.2	24	41.4
NO	7	87.5	13	54.2	13	50.0	33	56.9
NA	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.7	1	1.7
Total	8	13.8	24	41.4	26	44.8	58	100.0

### Graduate Teaching Responsibilities

A substantial number of LSU School of Music doctoral recipients have been involved in graduate level instruction since the completion of the doctorate. Thirty-eight (65.5%) of the respondents indicated that they had taught or supervised graduate students since the completion of the doctorate. A majority of respondents in all areas of concentration, except composition, were involved in graduate level instruction. However, the percentage of LSU School of Music graduates with graduate level responsibilities continued to decline during the successive periods of the study. Frequencies and percentages for this item are found in Table 4.

### Activity in Curriculum Development

Those educators involved in curriculum development must, among other considerations, be concerned about quality and effectiveness of those programs or areas developed. Thirty-five (60.3%) respondents indicated that they had been involved in curriculum development since the completion of the doctorate. Thirty-two (94.1%) of the thirty-five were involved in college-level curriculum development. Of the remaining two, one was involved in curriculum development on the secondary school level, while one had been involved in curriculum development on the elementary school level.

### Professional Affiliations

All respondents indicated membership in at least two professional music or educational organizations of national or



Table 4--Respondents who have taught graduate  
level courses

Have you taught or supervised graduate students?

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YES	4	44.4	11	61.1	8	66.7	15	78.9	38	65.5
NO	5	55.6	7	38.9	4	33.3	4	21.1	20	34.5
Total	9	15.5	18	31.0	12	20.7	19	32.8	58	100.0

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YES	8	100.0	17	70.8	13	50.0	38	65.5
NO	0	0.0	7	29.2	13	50.0	20	34.5
Total	8	13.8	24	41.4	26	44.8	58	100.0

international renown. The most frequently cited organizations included Music Educators National Conference, College Music Society, The American Musicological Society, and The National Association of Teachers of Singing. A complete list of these organizations is contained in Appendix L.

#### Publication

In responding to type and number of publications since the completion of the doctorate most respondents indicated little or no activity in the various categories listed. A total of sixty-seven articles were published by a total of fifteen (26%) respondents. Three books were published by two (3%) of the respondents. Six respondents indicated that they had been involved in the making of recordings for publication. The total number of these recordings was fourteen. Five respondents indicated that they had published musical compositions; the total number of which was forty-four.

#### Correspondence with LSU

A majority of respondents indicated that they had consulted LSU faculty members for professional advice or assistance. Forty-one (70.6%) of the respondents responded affirmatively to this item. This number included seven (77.8%) composition majors, twelve (66.7%) music education majors, seven (58.3%) music history/theory majors, and fifteen (79%) performance majors.

### Reasons for Seeking the Doctorate

Four possible responses were available to the respondent for the item regarding the motivation for seeking the doctorate. Seven respondents were motivated by practical reasons (i.e., for professional advancement or for some job-related reason). Only four respondents indicated that they were motivated by the academic objective of becoming a scholar or intellectual.

A majority of the respondents indicated that they were motivated, to some degree, by both practical and academic considerations. A total of forty-six (79.3%) respondents was included in this majority.

### Reasons for Choosing LSU

School of Music doctoral degree recipients chose LSU for doctoral study for a variety of reasons. The most frequently cited reasons were cost and location. Thirty-seven (64%) of the respondents indicated that they had chosen LSU for doctoral study because of cost. A majority of the respondents also indicated that location was an important factor in their decision to attend LSU.

Interestingly, more respondents chose to attend LSU because of the reputation of the School of Music than those who chose LSU because of the reputation of the University itself.

Two of the reasons listed for attending LSU which received rather low percentages were 1) the recommendation of an LSU graduate, and 2) recruitment by a faculty member.

Frequencies and percentages for this item are found in Table 5.

Table 5--Reasons for attending LSU

	Number	Percentage
Cost	37	64%
Location	35	60%
Reputation of University	26	45%
Reputation of School of Music	29	50%
Recommendation of LSU graduate	10	17%
Fellowship, assistantship, scholarship	16	28%
Recruited by faculty member	5	9%
Curriculum of particular interest	24	41%

### Duration of Study

Twenty-two (37.9%) respondents completed the doctorate in one uninterrupted period. Most respondents, however, interrupted their study with periods of employment. Thirty-two (55.2%) respondents completed the doctorate with intermittent periods of employment. The data in Table 6 reveal that there was a progressive decline in the percentage of graduates who completed the doctorate in one continuous period during the three periods covered by the study. During the first period, 1967-1971, 75% of the graduates completed their work without interruption. Thirty-seven and a half percent of the respondents who completed the degree between 1972 and 1976 did so without interruption. During the final period, only 26.9% of the respondents completed the doctorate in one continuous period.

The average amount of time spent by the respondents in completing the degree was 5.3 years. However, data in Table 7 show that twenty-three (39.6%) of the respondents needed between six and nine years to complete all requirements for the degree.

The average amount of time required by the respondents to complete course work alone was 3.3 years. Further, an average of almost two years (1.9 years) was required by the respondents for the period between completion of the general examination and the conferring of the degree. During this period it was assumed that most respondents were working on the dissertation (monograph). The data revealed that the average amount of time required to complete the

Table 6--Consistency of effort in completion of the degree

Did you complete the doctorate in one continuous period?

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Continuous	4	44.4	7	38.9	5	41.7	6	31.6	22	37.9
Interrupted by employment	5	55.6	11	61.1	7	58.3	9	47.4	32	55.2
Interrupted by other study	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.5	2	3.45
Interrupted because of personal reasons	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.5	2	3.45
Total	9	15.5	18	31.0	12	20.7	19	32.8	58	100.0
	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred									
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Continuous	6	75.0	9	37.5	7	26.9	22	37.9		
Interrupted by employment	2	25.0	12	50.0	18	69.2	32	55.2		
Interrupted by other study	0	0.0	2	8.3	0	0.0	2	3.45		
Interrupted because of personal reasons	0	0.0	1	4.2	1	3.9	2	3.45		
Total	8	13.8	24	41.4	26	44.8	58	100.0		

Table 7--Amount of time needed to complete the degree

Years	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
$\frac{1}{2}$ - 1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	1	1.7
$1\frac{1}{2}$ - 2	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	2	3.5
$2\frac{1}{2}$ - 3	2	22.2	3	16.7	2	16.7	4	21.1	11	18.9
$3\frac{1}{2}$ - 4	2	22.2	3	16.7	2	16.7	3	15.8	10	17.3
$4\frac{1}{2}$ - 5	1	11.1	4	22.2	3	25.0	3	15.8	11	18.9
$5\frac{1}{2}$ - 6	1	11.1	1	5.6	3	25.0	0	0.0	5	8.6
$6\frac{1}{2}$ - 7	0	0.0	4	22.2	1	8.3	2	10.5	7	12.1
$7\frac{1}{2}$ - 8	1	11.1	1	5.6	0	0.0	2	10.5	4	6.9
$8\frac{1}{2}$ - 9	1	11.1	2	11.1	1	8.3	3	15.8	7	12.1
Total	9	15.5	18	31.0	12	20.7	19	32.8	58	100.0

Years	Responses by period during which degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
$\frac{1}{2}$ - 1	0	0.0	1	4.2	0	0.0	1	1.7
$1\frac{1}{2}$ - 2	1	12.5	1	4.2	0	0.0	2	3.5
$2\frac{1}{2}$ - 3	3	37.5	6	25.0	2	7.7	11	18.9
$3\frac{1}{2}$ - 4	1	12.5	5	20.8	4	15.4	10	17.3
$4\frac{1}{2}$ - 5	3	37.5	2	8.3	6	23.1	11	18.9
$5\frac{1}{2}$ - 6	0	0.0	2	8.3	3	11.5	5	8.6
$6\frac{1}{2}$ - 7	0	0.0	3	12.5	4	15.4	7	12.1
$7\frac{1}{2}$ - 8	0	0.0	1	4.2	3	11.5	4	6.9
$8\frac{1}{2}$ - 9	0	0.0	3	12.5	4	15.4	7	12.1
Total	8	13.8	24	41.4	26	44.8	58	100.0

dissertation (monograph) was 1.8 years, although at least six respondents required four or more years to complete this requirement.

#### Foreign Language

Forty-six (79.3%) of the respondents were required to show competence in at least one foreign language. Of that number, thirty (65.2%) chose French; thirteen (28.3%) chose German, two (4.4%) chose Italian, and one (2.1%) chose Latin.

Twenty-three (39.7%) respondents indicated that a second language was required. Three (13.1%) of these respondents chose French as a second language. Sixteen (69.5%) chose German as a second language. Two (8.7%) of these twenty-three respondents chose Spanish as a second language. Italian, and likewise Latin, were chosen by one (4.35%) of those respondents who were required to show competence in two languages.

A majority of the respondents passed the examination for the first language on the first attempt. Only 6 (13%) needed a second time to pass the examination. In the fulfillment of the requirements for the second language, 77% passed the examination on the first attempt. Four respondents required a second time in order to pass the examination, while one respondent passed the examination on the third attempt.

#### Means of Financial Support

Forty-two (72%) of the respondents indicated that they were self-supported during the period of their doctoral study. Those



whose study was financed by a working spouse numbered twenty-five (43%). The third most frequently mentioned method of financial support was that of the teaching assistantship. Twenty-three (40%) of the respondents held teaching assistantships during the period of their study, while fourteen (24%) were supported by a fellowship or grant.

The number of respondents who secured government loans in order to finance their doctoral study was sixteen (28%). This represents a sharp contrast to the number of respondents who secured personal bank loans. Only five (9%) of the respondents took personal bank loans in order to support their study.

Support from parents was indicated by six (10%) of the respondents. Table 8 contains the frequencies and percentages for this item.

#### Evaluation of Doctoral Study

##### Familiarity with Course Offerings

A plurality of the respondents was partially familiar with the course offerings for doctoral students. Twenty-three (39.7%) indicated a partial familiarity with course offerings at the time of their enrollment.

A somewhat fewer number, twenty-one (36.2%), were completely familiar with course offerings. Fourteen (24.1%) of the respondents were either vaguely familiar or unfamiliar with the course offerings for doctoral students in the School of Music. The data in Table 9

Table 8—Means of financial support during doctoral study

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Self supported	42	72.4
Supported by parents	6	10.3
Working spouse	25	43.1
Government loans	16	27.6
Personal bank loans	5	8.6
Fellowship or grant	14	24.1
Teaching assistantship	23	39.7
Sabbatical grant	10	17.2

Table 9--Familiarity with course offerings at time of enrollment in doctoral program

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Completely familiar	4	44.4	5	27.8	4	33.3	8	42.1	21	36.2
Partially familiar	4	44.4	7	38.9	5	41.7	7	36.8	23	39.7
Vaguely familiar	1	11.1	3	16.7	1	8.3	3	15.8	8	13.8
Unfamiliar	0	0.0	3	16.7	2	16.7	1	5.3	6	10.3
Total	9	15.5	18	31.0	12	20.7	19	32.8	58	100.0
	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred									
	1967-71		1972-76		1976-May 1981		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Completely familiar	2	25.0	7	29.2	12	46.2	21	36.2		
Partially familiar	5	62.5	11	45.8	7	26.9	23	39.7		
Vaguely familiar	1	12.5	4	16.7	3	11.5	8	13.8		
Unfamiliar	0	0.0	2	8.3	4	15.4	6	10.3		
Total	8	13.8	24	41.4	26	44.8	58	100.0		

reveal that composition and performance majors were somewhat more familiar with course offerings than those respondents in other areas. Interestingly, the data also show that the percentage of respondents who expressed some degree of familiarity with course offerings continued to decrease during the successive periods of the study.

#### Opinions on the Number of Required Courses

Twenty-five respondents put forth an opinion regarding the number of required music education courses. Twenty (80%) respondents were of the opinion that the number of required courses was adequate. Four (16%) respondents felt that music education course offerings were too few. Only one (4%) respondent felt that there were too many required music education courses. Responses from the music education majors showed that a great majority (82.4%) of them were satisfied with the number of required courses in their area of concentration. Data for this item are found in Table 10.

Overall, a majority of the respondents who addressed the item regarding the number of required music history courses felt that the number of required music history courses was adequate. Forty-eight (84.2%) of the fifty-seven respondents felt that the number of music history courses was adequate. Seven (12.3%) respondents were of the opinion that they were required to take too many music history courses. Only two (3.5%) respondents felt that they were required to take too few music history courses. Most music history majors felt that the number of required music history courses was adequate. Those who felt that the number of required music history courses were too many

Table 10--Respondents' opinions of the number of  
required music education courses

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Too many	1	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.0
Too few	0	0.0	3	21.4	0	0.0	1	25.0	4	16.0
Adequate	2	66.7	14	82.4	1	100.0	3	75.0	20	80.0
Total	3	12.0	17	68.0	1	4.0	4	16.0	25	100.0

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Too many	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	7.7	1	4.0
Too few	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	30.8	4	16.0
Adequate	6	100.0	6	100.0	8	32.0	20	80.0
Total	6	24.0	6	24.0	13	52.0	25	100.0

included 22.2% of the music education majors and 16.7% of the performance majors. The data for this item are found in Table 11.

Most respondents felt that the number of required music theory courses was adequate. Forty-four (80%) respondents thought that the number of music theory courses which they were required to take was adequate. Five (9.1%) respondents felt that the number of required music theory courses was too many. Six (10.9%) respondents felt that they had not been required to take enough music theory courses. Table 12 contains the data for this item.

More than half (57.1%) of graduates had no composition course requirements. Of the twenty-four graduates who expressed an opinion relative to the number of required composition courses, eighteen (75%) felt that the number of required courses in composition was adequate. Five (20.8%) respondents indicated that they had been required to take too few composition courses. Table 13 includes data that show that only one respondent indicated that the number of required composition courses was too many. A larger majority (88.9%) of the composition majors was satisfied with the required number of composition courses.

Data in Table 14 show that forty-two respondents took performance courses. Twenty-nine (69%) respondents indicated that the number of required performance courses was adequate. Twelve respondents (28.6%) felt that they had not been required to take enough courses in performance. Only one respondent was of the opinion that the number of required performance courses was too great. Performance

Table 11--Respondents' opinions of the number of  
required music history courses

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Too many	0	0.0	4	22.2	0	0.0	3	16.7	7	12.3
Too few	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	16.7	0	0.0	2	3.5
Adequate	9	100.0	14	77.8	10	83.3	15	83.3	48	84.2
Total	9	15.8	18	31.6	12	21.1	18	31.6	57	100.0

  

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred									
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Too many	0	0.0	3	13.0	4	15.4	7	12.3		
Too few	1	12.5	1	4.4	0	0.0	2	3.5		
Adequate	7	87.5	19	82.6	22	84.6	48	84.2		
Total	8	14.0	23	40.4	26	45.6	57	100.0		

Table 12--Respondents' opinions of the number of  
required music theory courses

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Too many	0	0.0	4	22.2	0	0.0	1	5.9	5	9.1
Too few	1	11.1	0	0.0	2	18.2	3	17.6	6	10.9
Adequate	8	88.9	14	77.8	9	81.8	13	76.5	44	80.0
Total	9	16.4	18	32.7	11	20.0	17	30.9	55	100.0

  

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Too many	1	12.5	2	9.5	2	7.7	5	9.1
Too few	0	0.0	1	4.8	5	19.2	6	10.9
Adequate	7	87.5	18	85.7	19	73.1	44	80.0
Total	8	14.5	21	38.2	26	47.3	55	100.0



Table 13--Respondents' opinions of the number of  
required composition courses

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Too many	0	0.0	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.2
Too few	1	11.1	1	16.7	2	50.0	1	20.0	5	20.8
Adequate	8	88.9	4	66.6	2	50.0	4	80.0	18	75.0
Total	9	37.5	6	25.0	4	16.7	5	20.8	24	100.0

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred									
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Too many	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	1	4.2		
Too few	0	0.0	3	30.0	2	20.0	5	20.8		
Adequate	4	100.0	7	70.0	7	70.0	18	75.0		
Total	4	16.7	10	41.65	10	41.65	24	100.0		

Table 14--Respondents' opinions of the number of  
required performance courses

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Too many	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9	1	2.4
Too few	1	20.0	7	50.0	1	16.7	3	17.6	12	28.6
Adequate	4	80.0	7	50.0	5	83.3	13	76.5	29	69.0
Total	5	11.9	14	33.3	6	14.3	17	40.5	42	100.0

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred									
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Too many	0	0.0	1	5.0	0	0.0	1	2.4		
Too few	0	0.0	5	25.0	7	38.9	12	28.6		
Adequate	4	100.0	14	70.0	11	61.1	29	69.0		
Total	4	9.5	20	47.6	18	42.9	42	100.0		

majors themselves were less satisfied with the number of required performance courses than any of the other majors were with the number of required courses in their respective areas. Only 76.5% of the performance majors were satisfied with the number of required performance courses.

#### Sufficiency of Course Offerings

A majority of respondents felt that their interests had been completely met in terms of courses offered by the School of Music in the areas of music history, composition, and performance.

Thirty-one (53.4%) respondents indicated that their interests had been completely met in terms of courses offered in music history. Another twenty-three (39.7%) respondents felt that their interests had been partially met in terms of music history offerings. Four respondents (6.9%) indicated that their interests had not been met in music history course offerings. Of interest is the fact that a significantly smaller percentage of history majors were completely satisfied with the available courses in their area than the percentage of respondents in all other areas. Only 41.7% of the history majors felt that they had been satisfied in terms of the history courses available to them. The data for these items are found in Table 15.

In the area of composition, twelve (66.7%) respondents were of the opinion that their interests had been completely met in terms of course offerings. Five respondents (27.8%) were partially satisfied with course offerings in the area of composition. Only one

Table 15--Respondents' satisfaction with music history courses available

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interests:										
Completely met	6	66.7	9	50.0	5	41.7	11	57.9	31	53.4
Partially met	3	33.3	8	44.4	5	41.7	7	36.8	23	39.7
Not met	0	0.0	1	5.6	2	16.6	1	5.3	4	6.9
Total	9	15.5	18	31.0	12	20.7	19	32.8	58	100.0
Responses by period during which the degree was conferred										
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Interests:										
Completely met	3	37.5	14	58.3	14	53.8	31	53.4		
Partially met	3	37.5	8	33.3	12	46.2	23	39.7		
Not met	2	25.0	2	8.3	0	0.0	4	6.9		
Total	8	13.8	24	41.4	26	44.8	58	100.0		

respondent was not satisfied with course offering in the area of composition. Table 16 shows that a majority (87.5%) of the composition majors felt that their interests had been completely met in terms of course offerings.

A slight majority of respondents indicated that their interests had been completely met in terms of course offerings in the area of performance. Nineteen (51.4%) of those graduates who responded to this item were included in this majority. Of the thirty-seven respondents who addressed this item, eleven (29.7%) were partially satisfied with course offerings in performance. Seven respondents (18.9%) felt that course offerings in performance did not meet their specific interests. A small majority of performance majors felt that the School of Music had completely met their specific interests in terms of the courses offered. This majority included ten (55.6%) respondents. The data for this item are found in Table 17.

In the areas of music education and music theory, a plurality of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the course offerings. With twenty-one graduates addressing the question of sufficiency of courses in music education, ten (47.6%) indicated that their interests had been completely satisfied in terms of course offerings. Six (28.6%) respondents said that their interests were partially satisfied, while five (23.8%) felt that their interests had not been met. In considering only the responses of music education majors, a small majority (53.0%) indicated that their interests had been completely met. Data for this item are found in Table 18.

Table 16--Respondents' satisfaction with composition courses available

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interests:										
Completely met	7	87.5	2	40.0	1	50.0	2	66.7	12	66.7
Partially met	1	12.5	2	40.0	1	50.0	1	33.3	5	27.8
Not met	0	0.0	1	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.5
Total	8	44.4	5	27.8	2	11.1	3	16.7	18	100.0

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1976-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interests:								
Completely met	2	100.0	4	66.7	6	60.0	12	66.7
Partially met	0	0.0	2	33.3	3	30.0	5	27.8
Not met	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	10.0	1	5.5
Total	2	11.1	6	33.3	10	55.6	18	100.0

Table 17--Respondents' satisfaction with performance courses available

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interests:										
Completely met	2	50.0	5	45.4	2	40.0	10	55.6	19	51.4
Partially met	1	25.0	3	27.3	1	25.0	6	33.3	11	29.7
Not met	1	25.0	3	27.3	1	25.0	2	11.1	7	18.9
Total	4	10.8	11	29.7	4	10.8	18	48.7	37	100.0
	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred									
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Interests:										
Completely met	2	66.7	9	45.0	8	57.2	19	51.4		
Partially met	0	0.0	8	40.0	3	21.4	11	29.7		
Not met	1	33.3	3	15.0	3	21.4	7	18.9		
Total	3	8.1	20	54.1	14	37.8	37	100.0		

Table 18--Respondents' satisfaction with music education course offerings

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interests:										
Completely met	0	0.0	9	53.0	0	0.0	1	50.0	10	47.6
Partially met	1	100.0	5	29.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	28.6
Not met	0	0.0	3	17.6	1	100.0	1	50.0	5	23.8
Total	1	4.8	17	80.9	1	4.8	2	9.5	21	100.0

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interests:								
Completely met	2	40.0	2	40.0	6	54.5	10	47.6
Partially met	2	40.0	2	40.0	2	18.2	6	28.6
Not met	1	20.0	1	20.0	3	27.3	5	23.8
Total	5	23.8	5	23.8	11	52.4	21	100.0



Fifty-six graduates responded to the question of the sufficiency of course offerings in the area of music theory. Twenty-six (46.4%) respondents were satisfied that the courses offered had met their specific interests. Another twenty-one (37.5%) of the respondents were of the opinion that their interest had been partially met in terms of course offerings. Nine respondents (16.1%) were not satisfied with course offering with regards to their specific interests. Composition and music education majors were generally more satisfied with course offerings in music theory than were history majors and performance majors. Data in Table 19 indicate that an increasingly larger percentage of respondents during the three periods of the study have been satisfied with course offerings in the area of music theory.

#### Frequency of Course Offerings

A majority of the respondents indicated that required courses were included in the schedule often enough so as to avoid delay in the completion of their course work. The data in Table 20 indicate that required courses in music education and composition were offered often enough for all respondents with required courses in their areas. Only small percentages of the respondents who had required courses in the area of music history, music theory, and performance were delayed in the completion of their course work because of the unavailability of required courses. Eight (14.3%) of the fifty-six respondents who addressed the item regarding the frequency of music history courses indicated that the completion of their course work was delayed because

Table 19--Respondents' satisfaction with music theory course offerings

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Interests:										
Completely met	5	55.6	11	61.1	4	36.4	6	33.3	26	46.4
Partially met	2	22.2	5	27.8	5	45.5	9	50.0	21	37.5
Not met	2	22.2	2	11.1	2	18.1	3	16.7	9	16.1
Total	9	16.1	18	32.1	11	19.7	18	32.1	56	100.0
	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred									
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Interests:										
Completely met	3	37.5	10	45.5	13	50.0	26	46.4		
Partially met	1	12.5	10	45.5	10	38.5	21	37.5		
Not met	4	50.0	2	9.0	3	11.5	9	16.1		
Total	8	14.3	22	39.3	26	46.4	56	100.0		

Table 20--Respondents' opinions of whether required courses  
were included in the schedule often enough

	<u>YES</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Total</u>	
<u>Required Courses in:</u>					<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Composition	19	100.0	0	0.0	19	100.0
Music Education	22	100.0	0	0.0	22	100.0
Music History	48	85.7	8	14.3	56	100.0
Music Theory	49	89.1	6	10.9	55	100.0
Performance	31	93.9	2	6.1	33	100.0

---

of the unavailability of required music history courses. Similarly, six (10.9%) of the fifty-five respondents who had required music theory courses were delayed. Only two (6.1%) respondents with required performance courses were delayed in the completion of their course work because of the unavailability of required performance courses.

#### Selection of Dissertation Topic

Most respondents selected their dissertation (monograph) topic themselves. Thirty-four (58.6%) of the fifty-eight respondents independently selected their research topic. The second most frequent means of arriving at a research topic was by collaboration with a faculty member. Twenty-one (36.2%) respondents indicated that their topic was jointly selected by themselves and their advisor. Only two (3.5%) respondents said that their topic was suggested by their advisor, while one (1.7%) respondent had a topic suggested by the candidate's committee. For both variables, year of graduation and area of concentration, the data in Table 21 indicate that the overwhelming majority of respondents either chose their own topic or worked with their advisor in selecting a topic.

#### Work on Dissertation

Most respondents did not complete the dissertation (monograph) while in residence at the University. A majority of the respondents began work on the dissertation (monograph) while in residence at the University, however, only sixteen (27.6%) completed

Table 21--Selection of dissertation topic

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selected by:										
Graduate	6	66.7	12	66.7	8	66.7	8	42.1	34	58.6
Graduate and advisor	3	33.3	6	33.3	4	33.3	8	42.1	21	36.2
Advisor	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.5	2	3.5
Committee	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	1	1.7
Total	9	15.5	18	31.0	12	20.7	19	32.8	58	100.0

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Selected by:								
Graduate	5	62.5	12	50.0	17	65.4	34	58.6
Graduate and advisor	3	37.5	9	37.5	9	34.6	21	36.2
Advisor	0	0.0	2	8.3	0	0.0	2	3.5
Committee	0	0.0	1	4.2	0	0.0	1	1.7
Total	8	13.8	24	41.4	26	44.8	58	100.0

the dissertation (monograph) while they were still in residence at the University. Data found in Table 22 show that the percentage of recipients who completed the dissertation (monograph) while in residence at the University has continued to decline from a high of 37.5% during the years 1967-71 to a low of 23.1% between 1977 and May 1981. Analysis of the data by areas of concentration showed that of those respondents who completed all of the dissertation (monograph) while in residence at the University, the greatest percentage (33.3%) was found in the areas of composition and music history.

Only three (5.2%) of the fifty-eight respondents completed as much as 75% of the work on the dissertation (monograph) while at the University. This number included only performance majors.

Seven (12.1%) of the respondents indicated that they completed at least half of the dissertation (monograph) while in residence at the University.

A plurality of the respondents completed at least one-fourth of the work on the dissertation (monograph) while in residence at the University. This plurality included twenty-one (36.2%) respondents. The percentage of respondents in this category continued to increase during the three periods of the study from a low of 12.5% during the years 1967-71, to a high of 42.3% during the years 1977-May 1981.

Ten (17.2%) respondents completed the entire dissertation elsewhere. Most of those included in this group received the degree between 1977 and May 1981. By area of concentration, those

Table 22--Percentage of dissertation completed while  
in residence at the university

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
100%	3	33.3	5	27.8	4	33.3	4	21.1	16	27.6
75%	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	15.8	3	5.2
50%	0	0.0	3	16.7	2	16.7	2	10.5	7	12.1
25%	2	22.2	7	38.9	5	41.7	7	36.8	21	36.2
1%-24%	1	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.7
0%	3	33.3	3	16.7	1	8.3	3	15.8	10	17.2
Total	9	15.5	18	31.0	12	20.7	19	32.8	58	100.0

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
100%	3	37.5	7	29.2	6	23.1	16	27.6
75%	0	0.0	3	12.5	0	0.0	3	5.2
50%	3	37.5	2	8.3	2	7.7	7	12.1
25%	1	12.5	9	37.5	11	42.3	21	36.2
1%-24%	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.8	1	1.7
0%	1	12.5	3	12.5	6	23.1	10	17.2
Total	8	13.8	24	41.4	26	44.8	58	100.0

respondents included in this group were: composition, 3 (30%); music education, 3 (30%); music history/theory, 1 (10%); performance, 3 (30%).

#### The Dissertation Experience

The experience of writing the dissertation (monograph) was characterized as an enlightening intellectual experience by forty-four (75.9%) of the respondents. Analysis of the data for this item revealed that, by year of graduation as well as by area of concentration, most respondents felt that writing the dissertation (monograph) was an enlightening intellectual experience.

Five (8.6%) respondents were of the opinion that the dissertation experience was stimulating, albeit useless professionally.

In the opinion of six (10.3%) respondents, the dissertation experience was one of pedantic drudgery.

The data for this item are included in Table 23.

#### Morale During Doctoral Study

Many of the respondents indicated that their morale during the period of their doctoral study was either consistently high or progressively higher. Nineteen (32.8%) respondents described their morale as being consistently high, while six (10.3%) indicated that their morale was progressively higher.

Twenty-four (41.4%) respondents indicated that they had experienced fluctuating periods of highs and lows in terms of morale.



Table 23--Respondents' opinions of the dissertation experience

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Enlightening intellectual experience	8	88.9	12	66.7	11	91.7	13	68.4	44	75.9
Stimulating but useless professionally	0	0.0	3	16.7	1	8.3	1	5.3	5	8.6
Not stimulating but useful	1	11.1	1	5.5	0	0.0	1	5.3	3	5.2
Pedantic drudgery	0	0.0	2	11.1	0	0.0	4	21.1	6	10.3
Total	9	15.5	18	31.0	12	20.7	19	32.8	58	100.0
	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred									
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Enlightening intellectual experience	7	87.5	18	75.0	19	73.1	44	75.9		
Stimulating but useless professionally	1	12.5	2	8.3	2	7.7	5	8.6		
Not stimulating but useful	0	0.0	2	8.3	1	3.8	3	5.2		
Pedantic drudgery	0	0.0	2	8.3	4	15.4	6	10.3		
Total	8	13.8	24	41.4	26	44.8	58	100.0		

When asked what factors most affected morale before completion of the general examinations, respondents most frequently cited the following factors: 1) quality of instruction, 35 (60.3%); attitude of instructors, 34 (58.6%); course work load, 23 (39.7%).

#### Methods of Evaluation

Graduates were asked to express their opinions on the usefulness of various methods of evaluation which were applicable to them during their study. Almost all respondents agreed that grades, conferences with instructors, the instructor's written comments, evaluation by the doctoral committee, and self-evaluation, were, at the least, somewhat helpful in determining academic achievement. Interestingly, grades were considered less important than conferences with instructors, self-evaluation, and the instructor's written comments on assignments or lab work. Table 24 contains the data for this item.

#### Overall Quality of Instruction

As part of the evaluation of their doctoral study, graduates were asked to rate the overall quality of the academic climate relative to their course work. With "1" as the highest rating and "5" as the lowest rating the graduates rated several items pertaining to course work. For descriptive purposes the following scale was devised:

Table 24--Respondents' opinions on the importance of various methods of evaluation

	Most helpful		Somewhat helpful		Not helpful		Not Used		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grades	22	38.6	33	57.9	2	3.5	0	0.0	57	100.0
Conferences with faculty	38	66.7	16	28.1	1	1.8	2	3.5	57	100.0
Professor's written comments on assignments	27	47.4	16	28.1	6	10.5	8	14.0	57	100.0
Evaluation by other grad students	4	7.0	18	31.6	9	15.8	26	45.6	57	100.0
Committee evaluation	14	24.6	28	49.1	10	17.5	5	8.8	57	100.0
Self evaluation	37	64.9	16	28.1	1	1.8	3	5.2	57	100.0

.5-1.4	excellent
1.5-2.4	good
2.5-3.4	fair
3.5-4.4	marginal
4.5-5.4	poor

The analysis of the data for the item concerning the sufficiency of the challenge of course work revealed that most respondents felt that the course work was sufficiently challenging. Twenty-nine respondents (51.8%) gave this item a rating of one (1.0), while seventeen (30.4%) gave this item a rating of two (2.0). Thus, forty-six (82.2%) respondents rated this item as being good to excellent, with a mean rating of 1.8. Data for this item are found in Table 25.

In considering whether course work encouraged research, twenty-five (44.6%) respondents gave the statement a rating of one (1.0), while sixteen (28.6%) responded with a rating of two (2.0). The mean rating was 1.9.

A majority of the respondents felt that, through their course work, they had been exposed to current trends in music. Of the fifty-six respondents to this item, twenty-eight (50%) gave a rating of one (1.0), while fourteen (25%) gave a rating of two (2.0). Thus, a total of forty-two (75%) respondents rated the item as good to excellent. Analysis of the data by area of concentration revealed that composition majors gave this item the highest good to excellent rating, while performance majors issued the lowest good to excellent rating. Additionally, the data in Table 26 show that earlier graduates gave a higher rating to this item than more recent graduates.

Table 25--Respondents' opinions of the sufficiency  
of the course work challenge

Rating	Response by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	5	55.6	11	61.1	5	45.4	8	44.4	29	51.8
2	1	11.1	6	33.3	3	27.3	7	38.9	17	30.3
3	2	27.2	1	5.6	1	9.1	3	16.7	7	12.5
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	1	1.8
5	1	11.1	0	0.0	1	9.1	0	0.0	2	3.6
Total	9	16.1	18	32.1	11	19.6	18	32.1	56	100.0

Mean = 1.8

Rating	Response by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	5	62.5	11	50.0	13	50.0	29	51.8
2	1	12.5	9	40.9	7	26.9	17	30.3
3	0	0.0	2	9.1	5	19.2	7	12.5
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.9	1	1.8
5	2	25.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.6
Total	8	14.3	22	39.3	26	46.4	56	100.0

Table 26--Respondents' opinions of whether course work  
gave exposure to current trends

Rating	Response by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	7	77.8	9	50.0	5	41.7	7	41.2	28	50.0
2	1	11.1	5	27.8	4	33.3	4	23.5	14	25.0
3	1	11.1	3	16.7	1	8.3	4	23.5	9	16.1
4	0	0.0	1	5.6	2	16.7	1	5.9	4	7.1
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.9	1	1.8
Total	9	16.1	18	32.1	12	21.4	17	30.4	56	100.0

Mean = 1.9

Rating	Response by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	7	87.5	9	40.9	12	46.2	28	50.0
2	0	0.0	8	36.4	6	23.1	14	25.0
3	1	12.5	3	13.6	5	19.2	9	16.1
4	0	0.0	2	9.1	2	7.7	4	7.1
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.8	1	1.8
Total	8	14.3	22	39.3	26	46.4	56	100.0

In response to the item which sought to determine if instruction presented a comprehensive view of the subject being studied, fifteen (27.8%) respondents gave a rating of one (1.0), while twenty-three (42.6%) gave a rating of two (2.0). Sixteen (28.7%) respondents gave this item a rating of three (3.0) or above. Stated descriptively, sixteen graduates felt that overall, a fair to poor job was done in presenting a comprehensive view of subject matter.

A majority of the respondents found the instruction which they received at LSU to be stimulating in terms of scholarship and intellectual development. Forty-five (80.4%) of the fifty-six responses were ratings of one (1.0) or two (2.0). The mean rating for this item was one and nine-tenths (1.9).

When graduates responded to the item which sought to determine what they thought of the scholastic ability and intellectual development of their peers in the School of Music, forty (70.2%) of the fifty-seven respondents felt that they were among students of high scholastic and intellectual development.

The one item which fared poorest in the rating of the overall quality of the academic climate dealt with the opportunity for students to practically apply or test ideas, methods, or techniques in class. Twenty-nine (59.2%) of fifty-seven respondents rated this item at three (3.0) or above. The mean rating was two and eight-tenths (2.8). Analysis of the data by area revealed that only composition majors felt that they had been provided with the

opportunity for practical application or testing of ideas, methods, or techniques in class. Table 27 contains the data for this item.

Thirty-six (67.9%) of the fifty-three respondents who gave a rating to the item which dealt with the adequacy of library reference materials for courses offered felt that the library materials were adequate. A total of seventeen (32.1%) of the respondents expressed some degree of doubt about the adequacy of library reference materials for courses offered.

#### Music Library

Doctoral graduates were requested to give their opinions on several items regarding the operation of the music library. In considering the congeniality of the library atmosphere for research and study, thirty-four (63.0%) respondents agreed that the music library did provide a congenial atmosphere for research and study. However, twenty (37.0%) respondents were of the opposite opinion. Ten (62.5%) of the sixteen music education majors were of the opinion that the library atmosphere was not conducive to research and study. In all other areas of concentration, a majority of the respondents indicated that they agreed that the music library provided a congenial atmosphere for research and study. Table 28 shows that the percentage of graduates who were satisfied with the library atmosphere continued to decline during the successive periods of the study.

Forty-five (79.0%) respondents agreed that the music library was open for a sufficient number of hours during the school week.



Table 27--Respondents' opinions of whether course work provided an opportunity for practical application or testing of ideas presented

Rating	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	2	25.0	3	16.7	1	12.5	0	0.0	6	12.2
2	3	37.5	4	22.2	2	25.0	5	33.3	14	28.6
3	1	12.5	5	27.8	4	50.0	6	40.0	16	32.7
4	0	0.0	5	27.8	0	0.0	3	20.0	8	16.3
5	2	25.0	1	5.6	1	12.5	1	6.7	5	10.2
Total	8	16.3	18	36.7	8	16.3	15	30.6	49	100.0

Rating	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	2	25.0	2	11.7	2	8.3	6	12.2
2	3	37.5	5	29.4	6	25.0	14	28.6
3	2	25.0	5	29.4	9	37.5	16	32.7
4	0	0.0	3	17.7	5	20.8	8	16.3
5	1	12.5	2	11.8	2	8.3	5	10.2
Total	8	16.3	17	34.7	24	49.0	49	100.0

Table 28--Respondents' opinions of whether the music library  
provided a congenial atmosphere for research and study

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Agree	8	88.9	6	37.5	9	81.8	11	61.1	34	63.0
Disagree	1	11.1	10	62.5	2	18.2	7	38.9	20	37.0
Total	9	16.7	16	29.6	11	20.4	18	33.3	54	100.0

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Agree	7	87.5	14	70.0	13	50.0	34	63.0
Disagree	1	12.5	6	30.0	13	50.0	20	37.0
Total	8	14.8	20	37.0	26	48.2	54	100.0

However, only twenty-one (46.7%) respondents felt that the library was open for a sufficient number of hours during the weekend to provide adequate access to library holdings. A majority, twenty-four (53.3%), of the respondents felt that the library was not open for a sufficient amount of time during the weekend. Recent graduates were more dissatisfied with the number of weekend library hours than earlier graduates. During the first period of the study, 1967-71, 83.3% of the respondents felt that the weekend library hours were sufficient. However, during the period from 1977 up to May, 1981, only 40% of the respondents felt that the weekend hours were sufficient.

In response to the item which sought the graduates' opinions on whether the music library housed quality audio-visual equipment, a majority of the respondents indicated that the equipment was not quality equipment. Thirty-two (68.1%) respondents took this position.

Most respondents felt that they did not have sufficient access to audio-visual aids and equipment. Thirty-one (64.6%) respondents were of this opinion. Performance majors overwhelmingly maintained this position. Thirteen (86.7%) of the fifteen performance majors who responded to this item felt that they did not have sufficient access to the library's audio-visual aids and equipment during the period of their study. A majority of the graduates from two of the three periods of the study, 1972-76 and 1977-May 1981, felt that access to audio-visual equipment was too limited.

### Physical Facilities

A majority of the respondents felt that both classrooms and practice rooms were adequately equipped and conducive to practice and learning. Additionally, twenty-nine (70.7%) of the respondents thought that the practice room instruments were well kept, quality instruments. Interestingly, a majority of the performance majors, 64.3% were dissatisfied with the quality of practice room instruments.

### Importance of Musical Acoustics

School of Music doctoral graduates were asked to indicate the importance of the knowledge of musical acoustics since the completion of the doctorate. Twenty (34.5%) respondents said that knowledge of acoustics had been very important to them, while twenty-three (39.7%) respondents indicated that knowledge of musical acoustics had been important to them since the completion of the doctorate. A majority of the respondents, within each area of concentration, indicated that knowledge of acoustics had been, at the least, important.

### Importance of Foreign Language

The number of respondents who indicated that the knowledge of the required foreign language had been either important or very important was thirty-one (57.4%). This number included a majority of respondents in all areas of concentration except music education. Only eight (44.4%) of the eighteen music education graduates indicated that knowledge of the required foreign language had been

either important or very important. Interestingly, during each successive period of the study a majority of the respondents felt that the required foreign language had been important or very important. The data for this item are included in Table 29.

#### Quality of Graduate Music Faculty

School of Music graduates were asked to give their opinions of the quality of the graduate music faculty during the period of their study. Given such choices as "distinguished," "strong," "good," "adequate," "marginal," and "not sufficient for doctoral training," fifty-seven graduates responded to this item. The data in Table 30 show that only six (10.5%) respondents described the graduate music faculty as being "distinguished." This number included one composition major, three music education majors, one history/theory major, and one performance major.

A plurality of the respondents, twenty-seven (47.4%), described the faculty as being "strong." This was the choice of five (55.6%) of the nine composition majors, eight (44.4%) of the eighteen music education majors, six (50%) of the twelve music history/theory majors, and eight (44.4%) of the eighteen composition majors who responded to this item.

Eleven (19.3%) respondents described the graduate music faculty as being "good." Five (27.8%) of the eighteen performance majors, two (11.1%) of the eighteen music education majors, one (11.1%) of the nine composition majors, and one (8.3%) of the twelve music history/theory majors were included in this group.

Table 29--Respondents' opinions of the importance of the required foreign language

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very important	1	11.1	6	33.3	8	66.7	6	40.0	21	38.9
Important	4	44.4	2	11.1	1	8.3	3	20.0	10	18.5
Of little importance	4	44.4	6	33.3	3	25.0	2	13.3	15	27.8
Of no importance	0	0.0	4	22.2	0	0.0	1	6.7	5	9.2
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	20.0	3	5.6
Total	9	16.7	18	33.3	12	22.2	15	27.8	54	100.0
Responses by period during which the degree was conferred										
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Very important	4	50.0	9	42.9	8	32.0	21	38.9		
Important	1	12.5	4	19.1	5	20.0	10	18.5		
Of little importance	3	37.5	5	23.8	7	28.0	15	27.8		
Of no importance	0	0.0	2	9.5	3	12.0	5	9.2		
Other	0	0.0	1	4.8	2	8.0	3	5.6		
Total	8	14.8	21	38.9	25	46.3	54	100.0		

Table 30--Respondents' opinions of the quality of the graduate faculty

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Distinguished	1	11.1	3	16.7	1	8.3	1	5.6	6	10.5
Strong	5	55.6	8	44.4	6	50.0	8	44.4	27	47.4
Good	1	11.1	4	22.2	1	8.3	5	27.8	11	19.3
Adequate	2	22.2	2	11.1	1	8.3	3	16.7	8	14.0
Marginal	0	0.0	1	5.6	2	16.7	0	0.0	3	5.2
Not sufficient for doctoral training	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.6	1	1.8
No comment	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	0	0.0	1	1.8
Total	9	15.8	18	31.6	12	21.0	18	31.6	57	100.0

  

	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred							
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Distinguished	1	12.5	2	8.7	3	11.5	6	10.5
Strong	6	75.0	10	43.5	11	42.3	27	47.4
Good	0	0.0	6	20.1	5	19.2	11	19.3
Adequate	0	0.0	3	13.0	5	19.2	8	14.0
Marginal	1	12.5	0	0.0	2	7.7	3	5.2
Not sufficient for doctoral training	0	0.0	1	4.4	0	0.0	1	1.8
No comment	0	0.0	1	4.4	0	0.0	1	1.8
Total	8	14.0	23	40.4	26	45.6	57	100.0

A total of eight (14.0%) of the respondents described the graduate music faculty as being "adequate." Included in this number were three (16.7%) of the eighteen performance majors, two (22.2%) of the nine composition majors, two (11.1%) of the eighteen music education majors, and one (8.3%) of the twelve music history/theory majors.

Three graduates described the graduate music faculty as being "marginal." Two (16.7%) of the twelve music history/theory graduates and one (5.6%) of the eighteen music education graduates were of this opinion.

Only one (1.8%) graduate, a performance major, described the quality of the graduate music faculty as being "not sufficient for doctoral training."

#### Quality of the Doctoral Program

In order to determine what LSU School of Music doctoral graduates thought of the overall quality of the doctoral program in their specific areas of specialization, they were asked to describe the doctoral program as being "distinguished," "strong," "good," "adequate," "marginal," or "not sufficient for doctoral training."

A total of eleven (19%) respondents described the quality of the doctoral program as being "distinguished." Five (22.2%) of the eighteen music education majors, five (55.6%) of the nine composition majors, and two (10.5%) of the nineteen performance majors thought that the quality of the doctoral program was distinguished.



The most frequent response checked by the respondents was "strong." Twenty-five (43.1%) respondents described the doctoral program as being strong. This plurality of the respondents included two (22.2%) of the nine composition majors, seven (38.9%) of the eighteen music education majors, seven (58.3%) of the twelve music history/theory majors, and nine (47.4%) of the nineteen performance majors.

The second most frequent response chosen by the respondents was "good." Eleven (19.3%) of the respondent felt that the quality of the doctoral music program was good. Analysis of the data by area of concentration revealed that one (11.1%) of the nine composition majors, four (22.2%) of the eighteen music education majors, and five (26.3%) of the nineteen performance majors were included in this group.

Seven (12.1%) of the respondents were of the opinion that the quality of the doctoral program could be described as adequate. This number included one (11.1%) of the nine composition majors, three (16.7%) of the eighteen music education majors, two (16.7%) of the twelve music history/theory majors, and one (5.3%) of the nineteen performance majors.

Only one respondent, a performance major, felt that the doctoral program should be described as "marginal."

Two respondents, one performance major and one music history/theory major, felt that the doctoral program was "not sufficient for doctoral training."

One respondent chose not to express an opinion on this item.

Data for this item are found in Table 31.

### Curriculum Objectives

Thirty-nine curriculum objectives of graduate study in music were compiled for consideration by the doctoral graduates. Several objectives were selected for each academic area within the School of Music. The graduates were first asked to indicate the importance of each relevant objective in their particular program of study by deciding whether the objective was "most important," "very important," "moderately important," "of little importance," or "of no importance." Secondly, the graduates were asked to indicate the effectiveness of the instruction at LSU in achieving the desired outcome of the objective by deciding whether the instruction was "most effective," "very effective," "moderately effective," "slightly effective," or "not effective." Each possible response was assigned a numerical value during the process of data analysis. The responses "most important," "very important," "moderately important," "of little importance," and "of no importance" received numerical values of one, two, three, four, and five, respectively. Likewise, the responses "most effective," "very effective," "moderately effective," "slightly effective," and "not effective" received numerical values of one, two, three, four, and five, respectively.

For each objective a mean response was computed. The following scale was used in the analysis of the mean response:

Table 31--Respondents' opinions of the overall quality of the doctoral music program

	Responses by area of concentration									
	Composition		Music Ed.		Music Hist./Th.		Performance		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Distinguished	5	55.6	4	22.2	0	0.0	2	10.5	11	19.0
Strong	2	22.2	7	38.9	7	58.3	9	47.4	25	43.1
Good	1	11.1	4	22.2	1	8.3	5	26.3	11	19.0
Adequate	1	11.1	3	16.7	2	16.7	1	5.3	7	12.1
Marginal	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	1	1.7
Not sufficient for doctoral training	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	1	5.3	2	3.4
No comment	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	8.3	0	0.0	1	1.7
Total	9	15.5	18	31.0	12	20.7	19	32.8	58	100.0
	Responses by period during which the degree was conferred									
	1967-71		1972-76		1977-May 1981		Total			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Distinguished	4	50.0	2	8.33	5	19.2	11	19.0		
Strong	3	37.5	10	41.7	12	46.2	25	43.1		
Good	0	0.0	8	33.3	3	11.5	11	19.0		
Adequate	0	0.0	1	4.2	6	23.1	7	12.1		
Marginal	0	0.0	1	4.2	0	0.0	1	1.7		
Not sufficient for doctoral training	1	12.5	1	4.2	0	0.0	2	3.4		
No comment	0	0.0	1	4.2	0	0.0	1	1.7		
Total	8	13.8	24	41.4	26	44.8	58	100.0		

- .5-1.4 most important (most effective)
- 1.5-2.4 very important (very effective)
- 2.5-3.4 moderately important (moderately effective)
- 3.5-4.4 little importance (slightly effective)
- 4.5-5.4 no importance (not effective)

The graduates' responses resulted in five types of responses as indicated below:

	<u>Importance of Objective</u>	<u>Effectiveness of Instruction</u>
Type I.	Most important	Very effective
Type II.	Very important	Very effective
Type III.	Very important	Moderately effective
Type IV.	Moderately important	Moderately effective
Type V.	Moderately important	Very effective

As can be seen from the list of response types there were no responses in which opposite extremes were used. No graduate, for example, felt that a particular objective was most important while the instruction was not effective.

Those objectives with Type I and Type II responses were considered to be quite favorable in terms of the assessment of quality in the School of Music. Twenty-seven objectives received Type I responses. Another five objectives received Type II responses.

Two objectives received Type III responses. In considering the objective, "Comprehensive knowledge of the sociological foundations of music education," the graduates' mean response for the importance of the objective was 2.33. The mean response for the

effectiveness of instruction was 2.5. Similarly, the mean response for the importance of objective number thirty-three which was concerned with the ability to arrange/edit a composition for instrumental solo or ensemble, was 1.9. The mean response for the effectiveness of instruction was 2.5.

Three objectives received Type IV responses. Included in this response category were the following objectives:

<u>Objective No.</u>	<u>Objective</u>
14	Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the medieval period for a major instrument
20	Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the medieval period
34	Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the medieval period.

Two objectives were given a mean importance response of "moderately important" and a mean effectiveness response of "very effective." This Type V response occurred in following the analysis of data for the following objectives:

<u>Objective No.</u>	<u>Objective</u>
1	Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the medieval period in music history

- 15                    Knowledge of and technical command of music literature of the Renaissance period for a major instrument.

Interestingly, while the instruction for achieving the objectives received a favorable rating, on the average the graduates seemed to think these objectives to be less important than similiarly stated objectives for other historical periods.

A list objectives by response type is included in Appendix K.

#### Suggestions for Improvement

The final section of the questionnaire was designed to allow the graduates to make suggestions for improvement of the doctoral program. The graduates were also encouraged to comment freely on strong points of the doctoral program. A complete list of the responses for this section is found in Appendices B-I. To facilitate the study of these suggestions and comments, they have been recorded according to area of concentration.

#### Advising

Advising received very favorable compliments from most of the graduates who offered comments and suggestions for improvement. Superlative descriptors such as "excellent," "super-strong," "well done," and "extremely adequate and helpful" were used to describe the quality of advising. A number of graduates were especially pleased with the sincerity and personal interest exhibited by their advisors.

The most frequently cited suggestion for improvement was a call for more periodic advising.

See Appendix B for a complete list of comments on advising.

#### Course Requirements and Course Offerings

While some graduates felt that the course requirements and course offerings within the School of Music were adequate, others registered noteworthy complaints. A number of the graduates called for a reduction in the history and theory requirements. There were also several pleas for the reduction in or the elimination of the language requirement.

The recommendation which was quite prevalent in all areas of concentration was that there should be more specificity in course offerings within the various areas of concentration. The following are samples of that recommendation:

1. "Many more specific courses in music education needed desperately (and more faculty)."
2. "In literature and history, needed more specific topic courses, rather than era or survey courses."
3. "A course in Schenker would seem to be needed in the theory area."
4. "A course on how to teach 20th century performance techniques should be offered."

### Dissertation

Many of the graduates expressed gratitude for having received good guidance and advice during the dissertation process. In addition, a number of interesting suggestions were offered by the graduates.

A performance major recommended that the student's private instructor also be the chairman of the student's doctoral committee in order to avoid communication conflicts. One of the composition majors warned that recent ruling of the copyright law should be meticulously studied in order to avoid problems in the use of copyrighted materials.

Three respondents registered complaints about the lack of full committee participation in the dissertation process, particularly in regards to pre-final comments and suggestions on form and content.

### Grading

Most respondents were of the opinion that grading was fair and that the existing system used by the University was acceptable as is. However, at least four complaints were made about alleged inconsistencies in the awarding of grades, especially in the area of applied music.

One respondent recommended the use of pass/fail grades in applied courses for non-performance doctoral students.



### Placement Examinations

Most respondents expressed satisfaction with the placement examination. It was variously described as "good," "fair," "thorough," and "acceptable."

Several respondents, however, felt that the examination was not sufficiently difficult and thus inadequate for diagnostic considerations.

### Qualifying and General Examinations

A majority of the respondents felt that these examinations were thorough and fair. However, attention should be brought to several interesting comments.

Some graduates felt that emphasis on these examinations weighed heavily in favor of history and theory at the expense of their major area.

Attention was brought to the fact that the two examinations were too similar in content.

At least one graduate complained that the allotted time period for the examinations was not sufficient.

### Final Examination

The graduates overwhelmingly approved of the manner in which the final examination was conducted. Most graduates felt that the examination was thorough as well as fair. A number of the graduates expressed appreciation for the relaxed atmosphere.

Physical Facilities

Almost all respondents agreed that the physical facilities and equipment were in need of improvement and/or upgrading. The graduates pointed out the need for improvement in the library facility and equipment, the need for more practice rooms, the need for ensemble rehearsal areas, and the need for rooms for small seminars.

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the doctoral music degree program at Louisiana State University through an analysis of the opinions of the doctoral degree recipients. A questionnaire was designed to obtain the necessary information regarding quality and effectiveness of the doctoral program as determined by those doctoral degree recipients whose degrees were conferred during the period 1967-May 1981. The data presented in Chapter III were based on the responses contained in the fifty-eight questionnaires which were completed and returned by July 1, 1981. A summary of the data found in these questionnaires as well as the conclusions reached as a result of the analysis of the data are included in this chapter.

#### Summary and Conclusions

Questionnaires were mailed to sixty-four LSU School of Music doctoral graduates. Fifty-eight (90.6%) graduates' returned questionnaires were used in the study. Two variables were used in the analysis of certain items contained in the questionnaire. An analysis of the data by area of concentration and by period of study was done. The areas of concentration included composition, music education, music history and literature, and performance. (Only

one respondent with a concentration in music theory returned the questionnaire. Therefore the area of music theory was collapsed with that of music history and literature.) The data were tabulated in terms of simple frequencies and percentages. In the two sections of the questionnaire in which rating scales were used, a mean response was computed. The following is a summary of the findings of the study.

1. Of the fifty-eight respondents whose responses to the questionnaire provided the data for this study, thirty-one held the Ph.D. degree while twenty-seven held the D.M.A. degree. The majority of these graduates were white males. In terms of area of concentration, performance majors and music education majors were most numerous, with nineteen and eighteen graduates, respectively.

2. The respondents held one of five types of master's degrees from twenty-five different institutions of higher education. By far, the greatest number of these master's degrees were awarded by LSU.

3. Almost all of the respondents indicated that they were employed within the field. Four respondents were not employed as musicians but worked in some administrative capacity in education. Only one graduate was not employed. A majority of those respondents who were employed in music were employed in higher education.

4. Ten of the respondents had been involved in post-doctoral study; however, four of this number chose to pursue studies in other fields.

5. In terms of productivity in the publishing of books, articles, and recordings, only a small percentage of the respondents

had been engaged in such professional activities. Interestingly, all of the respondents were members of at least two professional music organizations.

6. Cost and location were the most frequently cited reasons for choosing LSU as the institution for the doctorate. Conversely the least frequently cited reasons for choosing LSU for doctoral study were recruitment by faculty members and the recommendation of an LSU graduate.

7. A decided majority of the respondents indicated that they had undertaken study for the doctoral degree because of a combination of practical and academic reasons. Of the three considerations (i.e., practical, academic, and a combination of practical and academic), the least cited reason for the seeking the doctorate was academic.

8. Most of the respondents did not complete the degree in one continuous period. Except for the period 1967-71, during which 75% of the degree recipients completed the degree in one continuous period, the remaining two five-year periods produced significantly less than a majority of degree recipients who completed the degree in one continuous period. During the approximately fifteen-year period from 1967 to 1981, the average amount of time required to complete the degree was 5.3 years. From 1967 through 1971, the average amount of time required to complete the degree was 3.8 years. By the time of the third period of the study, 1977-May 1981, the average time required to complete the degree had risen to 5.7 years. The increased amount of time required to complete the degree was

accompanied by increases in the amount of time required to complete course work and an increased amount of time required to complete the dissertation during successive periods of the study.

9. The foreign language chosen most often by the forty-six respondents who had foreign language requirements were French and German. A large majority of the respondents (87%) fulfilled the requirements for the courses (examinations) on the first attempt. A majority of the respondents indicated that knowledge of the foreign language had been important to them since the completion of the doctorate.

10. The respondents indicated that their doctoral study had been financed in a variety of ways during the tenure of their study. The means most frequently cited were 1) self support, 2) working spouse, 3) teaching assistantship.

11. Most respondents indicated that they were at least partially familiar with course offerings at the time of their enrollment in the doctoral program. In terms of satisfaction with course offerings, composition majors indicated that they were most satisfied with the course offering in their area. A small majority (53%) of the respondents were completely satisfied with course offerings in music history. Similarly, a slight majority of the respondents were satisfied with course offerings in the area of performance. In the remaining areas, less than 50% of the respondents who addressed the items which dealt with satisfaction with course offerings were completely satisfied.

12. Most respondents were satisfied with the course offerings within their areas of concentration. However, not more than 89% of the respondents within any given area of concentration were satisfied with course offerings within their area of concentration.

13. The respondents agreed that required courses were offered often enough so as to avoid delays in the completion of their course work.

14. A decided majority of the respondents felt that the dissertation (monograph) experience was intellectually enlightening. The respondents' topics were, for the most part, either chosen by themselves or jointly with the assistance of the advisor. During the successive periods of the study, the percentage of the dissertation completed while in residence at the university continuously decreased.

15. In describing their morale during the period of their doctoral study, the most frequently cited descriptions were "fluctuated between high and low" and "consistently high." The most frequently cited factors which affected morale were "quality of instruction" and "attitude of instructors."

16. Most respondents felt that their knowledge of musical acoustics had been, at the least, important to them since the completion of the doctoral degree. Knowledge of acoustics had been more important to composition majors and performance majors, than to music education majors and music history/theory majors.

17. Conferences with instructors and self-evaluation were the methods of evaluation which a majority of the respondents felt best helped them to determine their academic achievement.

18. A majority of the respondents felt very positive about the academic climate in the School of Music. Some concern was expressed about opportunities for in-class performance as well as the opportunity for practical application or testing of ideas, methods, or techniques presented in classes.

19. In addressing items relative to the operation and holdings of the music library, most students indicated satisfaction with reference materials, weekday operating hours, and the congenial atmosphere. The respondents expressed concern about weekend operating hours, the accessibility of audio-visual aids and equipment, and the quality of the audio-visual equipment.

20. In describing the quality of the graduate faculty, a majority of the respondents felt that the faculty was either distinguished, strong, or good. Similarly, a majority of the respondents felt that the overall quality of the graduate programs could be described as distinguished, strong, or good.

21. Most respondents felt that most of the objectives of graduate study in music, as stated in the questionnaire, were not only important to them, but also effectively achieved at LSU. Several objectives, which were described as moderately important, were concurrently said to have been somewhat lacking in effectiveness



of the instruction for achieving the objectives. All of these objectives dealt with either medieval performance practice, medieval theory, or compositional techniques and devices of the medieval period.

Two objectives were said to be very important but somewhat lacking in effectiveness of instruction. One objective dealt with the sociological foundations of music education and the other dealt with the ability to arrange or edit a composition for instrumental solo or for an ensemble.

22. Most respondents felt that advising was well done.

23. In offering suggestions for improvement of course requirements and course offerings, the respondents generally called for more specificity in the various areas.

24. The respondents overwhelmingly agreed that the physical facilities were in dire need of improvement, particularly in regard to practice rooms space for ensembles, quality audio-visual equipment.

#### Recommendations

While the data presented in this study provide numerous facts and opinions about the doctoral music program at LSU, further research in related areas could enhance the usefulness of this study. The following are suggestions for further research:

1. An evaluative study of current programs by current graduate students could provide very useful information on the strengths and weaknesses of the doctoral music program as determined by these

students. A planned, periodic study would be quite valuable in maintaining an accurate assessment of the program.

2. A follow-up study of those students who, for various reasons, chose to terminate their study at LSU may perhaps provide insight on quality and effectiveness from a unique point of view. An equally important group to study would be those students who complete all requirements except the dissertation.

3. A comparative study of the data contained in this study and data from similar studies should prove to be beneficial.

4. A study based on the evaluation of job performance of LSU School of Music doctoral graduates would give a more precise picture of the preparation of LSU's doctoral music graduates.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Axelrod, J., ed. Graduate Study for Future College Teachers. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1959.
- Berelson, Bernard. Graduate Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Carmichael, O. C. Graduate Education: A Critique and a Program. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.
- Cartter, A. M. An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.
- Colwell, Richard. The Evaluation of Music Teaching and Learning. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Devane, W. C. Higher Education in Twentieth-Century America. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Ernst, Karl D., and Gary, Charles L. Music in General Education. Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1965.
- Gardner, J. W. Agenda for the Colleges and Universities: Higher Education in the Innovative Society. New York: Academy for Educational Development, 1965.
- Glenn, Neal E., and Turrentine, Edgar M. Introduction to Advanced Study in Music Education. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1968.
- Grigg, Charles M. Graduate Education. New York: Center for Applied Research, 1965.
- Harmon, Lindsey R. A Century of Doctorates. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1978.
- Harvard University. Doctors of Philosophy and Doctors of Science of Harvard University, 1873-1926. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.
- Heiss, Ann M. Challenges to Graduate Schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970.

- Henderson, A. D. Higher Education in Tomorrow's World. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan, 1968.
- Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, LSU Graduate School Catalogue. Baton Rouge: LSU Publications, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. LSU Graduate School Catalogue. Baton Rouge: LSU Publications, 1972.
- McEachern, Edna. A Survey and Evaluation of the Education of School Music Teachers in the United States. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. Graduate and Professional Education, 1980. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1980.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. and Ford, Patrick F. Reform in Graduate and Professional Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.
- Music in Higher Education 1980-1981. Reston, VA: National Association of Schools and Music, 1981.
- Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.
- Phelps, Roger P. A Guide to Research in Music Education. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company, 1969.
- Roose, Kenneth D., and Anderson, Charles J. A Rating of Graduate Programs. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.
- Walker, Helen M., and Lev, Joseph. Statistical Inference. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1953.
- Walters, Everett, ed. Graduate Education Today. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

#### Periodicals

- Ball, Chuck; Ross, Jerrold; Mamlin, Harry R.; Martin, Gary; Brookhart, D. Edward; Cox, Bette Y. "Report of the MENC Commission on Graduate Music Teacher Education." Music Educators Journal, October 1980, pp. 46-52.

- Bent, H. E. "The Meaning of the Ph.D. Degree." Journal of Higher Education XXXIII (January, 1962): 13-19.
- Carmichael, Oliver C. "Improving the Quality of Graduate Education for Prospective College Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education XIII (September, 1962): pp. 253-257.
- Dart, Thurston. "The Origins of Music Degrees." The Musical Times CV/3 (March, 1964), pp. 190-191.
- Heiss, Ann M. "Berkeley Doctoral Students Appraise Their Academic Programs." The Educational Record, Winter 1967, 30-34.
- Kilenyi, Edward. "Doctoral Degrees for Applied Music." Music Journal, February 1956, pp. 22.
- Marchand, J. W. "Teaching, Testing and the Ph.D. Language Requirements." Modern Language Journal XLII (May 1958): pp. 238-243.
- Millett, J. D. "Graduate Education: A Reappraisal." Journal of Teacher Education, special issue on The Preparation of College Teachers, 1962, XIII (3), pp. 258-261.
- Thomas, B. J. "Is a Doctorate Worth the Effort?" The Education Digest XXXI (December 1965): pp. 42-44.

#### Dissertations

- Baird, Forrest. "A Follow-Up Inquiry of Secondary School Music Teachers Prepared at San Jose State College." Ed.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1955.
- Bunch, William Franklin. "An Evaluation of the Ph.D. Curriculum in Music at the University of Iowa from 1931 to 1967 through an Analysis of the Opinions of its Doctoral Graduates." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1969.
- Choate, James F., Jr. "An Analysis of the Undergraduate Curriculum and the Subsequent Professional Involvement of Selected Instrumental Music Education Graduates of Louisiana State University." Ed.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1976.
- Clinton, Robert L. "An Evaluative Study of the Effectiveness of the Music Education Programs in Texas Colleges," Ed.D. dissertation, Texas Technological College, 1962.

- Darnall, Josiah. "An Evaluation of the Bachelor of Music Education Curriculum at Murray State College Through an Analysis of the Opinions of its Teaching Graduates." Mus.Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1963.
- Finley, John T. "A Follow-Up Study of the Elementary and Secondary School Music Teachers Prepared at Jacksonville State University from 1956 Through 1968 Through a Survey of Graduates' Opinions, College Grades, Employers' Evaluation, and Pre-College Experience." Ed.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1969.
- Gilchrist, Charles H. "An Assessment of the Preparation of North Carolina Public School Music Teachers in Performance Practices of Black Gospel Music: Implications for Curriculum Revisions in Higher Education." Ed.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1980.
- Humphreys, Alfred W. "A Follow-Up Study of the Graduates of the School of Music of the University of Illinois." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1955.
- Kennedy, Arthur W. "The Doctoral Degree in Music in Universities and Colleges of the United States." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1955.
- Laxon, Charles R. "An Analysis of the Opinions of Selected Chico State College Graduates Regarding the Adequacy of Their Preparation to Teach Music." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1966.
- Lee, Cecil L. "Developing Patterns of the Undergraduate Music Education Curriculum in the United States." Ph.D. dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1966.
- Leman, John W. "A Descriptive Study of the Undergraduate Music Education Program for the Preparation of Choral Directors at Five Midwestern Universities During the 1972-73 School Year." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1974.
- Mathis, George Russell. "A Study of Music Teacher Preparation at Illinois Wesleyan University." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1962.
- Prince, Joseph N. "An Evaluation of the Graduate Programs in Music Education at the University of Illinois by the Degree Recipients now Teaching Music." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1968.

- Smith, Estus. "A Critical Study of Junior College Music Programs in the State of Mississippi." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1970.
- Stoll, Forrest. "An Evaluation of the Music Education Curriculum at the University of Utah, with Recommendations for Future Development." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1960.
- Thomas, Robert. "An Evaluation of the Music Program at Claflin College." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1981.
- Turner, William M. "A Follow-Up Study of Music Education at North Texas State College." Ed.D. dissertation, North Texas State College, 1959.
- Whitlock, John Bert. "A Study of the Music Education Program at the State University of Iowa During the Academic Years 1955-57." Ph.D. dissertation, State University of Iowa, 1958.
- Williams, Frank M. "A Survey-Appraisal of the Music Curricula of Liberal Arts Colleges Related to the Lutheran Church in America." Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1969.
- Wilson, George. "A Study of Professional and Music Education at the Ohio State University." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1958.
- Woodard, Clair. "An Investigation of Music Education at the University of Colorado Including a Follow-Up of Graduates." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Colorado, 1963.
- Worrell, John W. "An Evaluation of Teacher Preparation in Music Education at the University of Kentucky through an Analysis of the Opinions of Graduates." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1957.

## APPENDICES



APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER, INTRODUCTORY LETTER, AND QUESTIONNAIRE

2570 78th Avenue  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70807  
April 20, 1981

Dear LSU Graduate:

I am presently engaged in the collection of data pertaining to the quality and effectiveness of the LSU doctoral music program. The information collected will be used in a dissertation which will focus on the quality of the program as determined by the doctoral graduates. I respectfully solicit your support of my efforts by completing the questionnaire which accompanies this letter.

In a pretest of the questionnaire, the average time required to respond to all of the questions was thirty-five (35) minutes. Please respond to each question as spontaneously and frankly as possible.

In light of the small number of doctoral graduates (62) since the beginning of the degree program, your response is extremely important. Please return the completed questionnaire to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by May 12, 1981.

Sincerely,

Donzell Lee



Office of the Dean  
School of Music

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY AND AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE  
BATON ROUGE · LOUISIANA · 70803

504/388-3261

We in the School of Music should appreciate very much your cooperation with Mr. Donzell Lee in his dissertation. As we examine our curricula, your comments will provide us with an additional source of reference and give us a clearer picture of our strengths and weaknesses. The data Mr. Lee is assembling, when analyzed and evaluated, can be of great help in our efforts to provide the best possible doctoral programs. Therefore, we earnestly solicit your assistance on his behalf.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Lyle Merriman'.

Lyle Merriman  
Dean, School of Music

---

## QUESTIONNAIRE

AN EVALUATION OF THE LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITYSCHOOL OF MUSIC DOCTORAL DEGREE PROGRAM:A FOLLOW-UP OF ITS DOCTORALGRADUATES

## Instructions for Completing the Questionnaire

1. The questions below have been designed with two purposes in mind. While some of the questions are intended to provide factual information pertaining to your doctoral study, others are designed to determine your opinion of the doctoral music degree program at LSU during the period of your study.
2. To help insure anonymity and confidentiality, you have been assigned a code number to be used in lieu of your name.
3. Most responses may be made by placing a check mark (✓) by the desired response or by circling the desired response.

PART ONE

## Academic and Biographical Data

Code number      \_\_\_\_\_

## 1.0 Vital Statistics

1.1 Sex	1.11 Male	_____
	1.12 Female	_____

## 1.2 Racial/Ethnic Identification

1.21 White/Caucasian	_____
1.22 Black/Negro/ Afro-American	_____
1.23 American Indian	_____
1.24 Hispanic	_____
1.25 Oriental	_____
1.26 Other (specify)	_____

2.0 Doctoral degree	2.01 Ph.D.	_____
	2.02 D.M.A.	_____

## 2.1 Year in which degree was conferred

2.11 _____
year

2.12 _____
month

## 2.2 Area of Concentration

2.21 Composition	_____
2.22 Music Education	_____
2.23 Music History	_____
2.24 Music Theory	_____
2.25 Performance	_____

2.3 Major Instrument(s)	_____
	_____
	_____

## 3.0 Master's degree

3.01 M.M. \_\_\_\_\_  
3.02 M.A. \_\_\_\_\_  
3.03 M.S. \_\_\_\_\_  
3.04 M.M.Ed. \_\_\_\_\_  
3.05 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## 3.1 Year in which degree was conferred

3.11 \_\_\_\_\_  
year

3.12 \_\_\_\_\_  
month

## 3.2 Area of Concentration

3.21 Composition \_\_\_\_\_  
3.22 Music Education \_\_\_\_\_  
3.23 Music History \_\_\_\_\_  
3.24 Music Theory \_\_\_\_\_  
3.25 Music Therapy \_\_\_\_\_  
3.26 Performance \_\_\_\_\_  
3.27 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## 3.3 Major Instrument(s)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## 3.4 School

\_\_\_\_\_  
name

## 4.0 Occupational Data

4.1 Present Occupation  
(e.g., Teacher,  
Performer,  
Businessman)

\_\_\_\_\_

4.2 Title or Rank

\_\_\_\_\_

4.3 Job description

---

---

---

---

4.4 Employer

---

4.5 Date employed

month year

5.0 Previous Employment (since doctorate). List in chronological order. Use back side of this page if necessary.

5.1 Occupation

---

5.2 Title or Rank

---

5.3 Job description

---

---

---

---

5.4 Employer

---

5.5 Date employed

month year

6.0 Post-doctoral study

(If you have not done post-doctorate study, check number 6.5.)

6.1 Institution

---

6.2 Address

city state

6.3 Area of concentration

---

6.4 Date(s)

---

6.5 No post-doctorate study

---

7.0 Why did you choose LSU to do doctoral study? (Check as many as may apply.)

- 7.1 Cost \_\_\_\_\_
- 7.2 Location \_\_\_\_\_
- 7.3 Reputation of the University \_\_\_\_\_
- 7.4 Reputation of the School of Music \_\_\_\_\_
- 7.5 Recommendation of LSU graduate \_\_\_\_\_
- 7.6 Fellowship, assistantship, scholarship \_\_\_\_\_
- 7.7 Recruited by faculty member \_\_\_\_\_
- 7.8 Curriculum of particular interest \_\_\_\_\_
- 7.9 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8.0 Publications since graduation (Give number after appropriate category.)

- 8.1 Articles \_\_\_\_\_
- 8.2 Books \_\_\_\_\_
- 8.3 Recordings \_\_\_\_\_
- 8.4 Recitals \_\_\_\_\_
- 8.5 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

9.0 Have you taught or supervised graduate students at any time since completion of the doctorate?

- 9.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- 9.2 No \_\_\_\_\_

10.0 Have you been involved in curriculum development for any particular school since completion of the doctorate?

- 10.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- 10.2 No \_\_\_\_\_

If "yes," state area and grade level.

10.3 area \_\_\_\_\_

10.4 level \_\_\_\_\_

11.0 If you are presently not employed in music, briefly indicate why.

---



---



---



---



- 12.0 After completion of the doctorate, was your first position in music limited to your specific area of concentration?
- 12.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- 12.2 No \_\_\_\_\_
- 13.0 Have you corresponded with or consulted your major professor or another LSU faculty member for professional advice or assistance since completion of your degree?
- 13.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- 13.2 No \_\_\_\_\_
- 14.0 List professional affiliation
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- 15.0 Please indicate the primary reason for seeking the doctorate.
- 15.1 Practical (job related, professional advancement) \_\_\_\_\_
- 15.2 Academic (intellectual/scholastic development) \_\_\_\_\_
- 15.3 Combination of practical and academic \_\_\_\_\_
- 15.4 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 16.0 Did you complete the doctorate in one continuous period or was your work interrupted by periods (semesters) of non-enrollment?
- 16.1 Continuous \_\_\_\_\_
- 16.2 Interrupted by
- 16.21 Employment \_\_\_\_\_
- 16.22 Study in another academic area \_\_\_\_\_
- 16.23 Military service \_\_\_\_\_
- 16.24 Pregnancy \_\_\_\_\_
- 16.25 Illness \_\_\_\_\_
- 16.26 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

- 17.0 Give the number of elapsed years, to the nearest 1/2 year, between starting doctoral study and the awarding of the degree. \_\_\_\_\_
- 18.0 Give the number of elapsed years, to the nearest 1/2 year, between starting and completing required course work. \_\_\_\_\_
- 19.0 Give the number of elapsed years, to the nearest 1/2 year, between passing of general examinations and awarding of the degree. \_\_\_\_\_
- 20.0 Give the number of elapsed years, to the nearest 1/2 year, between starting the dissertation (monograph) and completion of the dissertation (monograph).
- 21.0 What foreign language(s) did you choose for completion of the language requirements? (If no language was required, check "None" on line 21.7.)
- 21.1 French \_\_\_\_\_
- 21.2 German \_\_\_\_\_
- 21.3 Italian \_\_\_\_\_
- 21.4 Latin \_\_\_\_\_
- 21.5 Spanish \_\_\_\_\_
- 21.6 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 21.7 None \_\_\_\_\_
- 22.0 How many times did you take the examination or course in order to fulfill the language requirement?
- 22.1 First language \_\_\_\_\_
- 22.2 Second language \_\_\_\_\_
- 23.0 Were you ever enrolled at any other school, while attending LSU, for credit for a required course in your degree program?
- 23.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- 23.2 No \_\_\_\_\_

If "yes," please briefly state why course was not taken at LSU.

---

---

---

## 24.0 How was your doctoral study financed while attending LSU?

- |      |                        |       |
|------|------------------------|-------|
| 24.1 | Self-supported         | _____ |
| 24.2 | Supported by parents   | _____ |
| 24.3 | Working spouse         | _____ |
| 24.4 | Government loans       | _____ |
| 24.5 | Bank loans             | _____ |
| 24.6 | Fellowship or grant    | _____ |
| 24.7 | Teaching assistantship | _____ |
| 24.8 | Sabbatical grant       | _____ |
| 24.9 | Other (specify)        | _____ |
-

PART TWO

## Evaluation of Doctoral Study

- 1.0 At the time of your enrollment in the doctoral program, how familiar were you with the course offerings for doctoral students in the School of Music as outlined in the University catalog?
- 1.1 Completely familiar \_\_\_\_\_
  - 1.2 Partially familiar \_\_\_\_\_
  - 1.3 Vaguely familiar \_\_\_\_\_
  - 1.4 Unfamiliar \_\_\_\_\_
- 2.0 Judging from your experience since completion of the doctoral degree, were required courses in the following areas (a) too numerous, (b) too few, (c) adequate, or (d) not applicable to your curriculum?
- 2.1 Music Education \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2.2 Music History \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2.3 Music Theory \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2.4 Composition \_\_\_\_\_
  - 2.5 Performance \_\_\_\_\_  
(including ensembles)
- 3.0 In the areas listed below, did the School of Music, during your enrollment, provide courses which (a) completely met your specific interests, (b) partially met your specific interests, (c) did not meet your specific interest? (If an area is not applicable to your program of study, mark "d" in the space provided. Otherwise, indicate your answer by marking "a," "b," or "c," as listed above, in the space provided.)
- 3.1 Music Education \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3.2 Music History \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3.3 Music Theory \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3.4 Composition \_\_\_\_\_
  - 3.5 Performance \_\_\_\_\_

- 4.0 In the following areas, were required courses, as outlined in your specific program, included in the schedule often enough so as to avoid delay in completion of course work? (Indicate "yes," "no," or "not applicable.")

	YES	NO	NA
4.1 Music Education	_____	_____	_____
4.2 Music History	_____	_____	_____
4.3 Music Theory	_____	_____	_____
4.4 Composition	_____	_____	_____
4.5 Performance	_____	_____	_____

- 5.0 How was your dissertation or monograph topic selected?

5.1 You selected it independently	_____
5.2 You and your advisor selected it jointly	_____
5.3 Your advisor suggested it	_____
5.4 Your committee suggested it	_____
5.5 Other (specify) _____	_____

- 6.0 What percentage of your dissertation (monograph) did you complete while in residence at the University?

6.1 25%	_____
6.2 50%	_____
6.3 75%	_____
6.4 100%	_____
6.5 Other (specify) _____	_____

- 7.0 Which of the following comes closest to describing the way you feel about the experience of writing a doctoral dissertation or monograph?

7.1 Enlightening intellectual experience	_____
7.2 Stimulating but useless professionally	_____
7.3 Not stimulating but useful professionally	_____
7.4 Pedantic drudgery not worth the effort in itself but necessary to get the degree	_____

8.0 Generally, how would you describe your morale as you worked toward the doctorate?

- 8.1 Consistently high \_\_\_\_\_
  - 8.2 Consistently low \_\_\_\_\_
  - 8.3 Progressively higher \_\_\_\_\_
  - 8.4 Progressively lower \_\_\_\_\_
  - 8.5 Fluctuated between high and low \_\_\_\_\_
  - 8.6 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 

9.0 Referring to your answer in the question immediately above, what factor(s), in order of importance, most affected your morale before completion of general examinations?

- 9.1 Personal problems \_\_\_\_\_
  - 9.2 Attitude of instructors \_\_\_\_\_
  - 9.3 Course work load \_\_\_\_\_
  - 9.4 Quality of instruction \_\_\_\_\_
  - 9.5 Physical facilities \_\_\_\_\_
  - 9.6 Attitude of fellow students \_\_\_\_\_
  - 9.7 Dissertation research and writing \_\_\_\_\_
  - 9.8 General examinations preparation \_\_\_\_\_
  - 9.9 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 

10.0 Of what importance has the knowledge of musical acoustics been to you since completion of the doctorate?

- 10.1 Very important \_\_\_\_\_
  - 10.2 Important \_\_\_\_\_
  - 10.3 Of little importance \_\_\_\_\_
  - 10.4 Of no importance \_\_\_\_\_
  - 10.5 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 

11.0 Of what importance has knowledge of the required foreign language(s) been to you since the completion of the doctorate?

- 11.1 Very important \_\_\_\_\_
  - 11.2 Important \_\_\_\_\_
  - 11.3 Of little importance \_\_\_\_\_
  - 11.4 Of no importance \_\_\_\_\_
  - 11.5 Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
-

The following six items deal with various methods of evaluation. Indicate how helpful each item was to you in determining your academic achievement during your doctoral study at LSU. Indicate your response by marking the appropriate letter in the space provided.

a = most helpful  
b = somewhat helpful  
c = not helpful  
d = not used or offered

- |      |   |              |
|------|---|--------------|
| 12.0 | Grades  | _____        |
| 13.0 | Conferences with faculty  | _____        |
| 14.0 | Professor's written comment on assignments or lab work  | _____        |
| 15.0 | Evaluation by other graduate students   | _____        |
| 16.0 | Evaluation by committee   | _____        |
| 17.0 | Self-evaluation   | _____        |
|      |   |              |
| 18.0 | On a scale of 1 to 5, rate the following statement relative to the overall quality of the academic climate in the School of Music. A "1" would indicate the highest rating, while a "5" would indicate the lowest rating. If a particular statement is not relevant to your study while at LSU, indicate this by circling "NA." Circle the number indicating your assessment. |              |
| 18.1 | Course work sufficiently challenging  | 1 2 3 4 5 NA |
| 18.2 | Course work encouraged research   | 1 2 3 4 5 NA |
| 18.3 | Course work provided exposure to current trends in music  | 1 2 3 4 5 NA |
| 18.4 | Course work provided ample opportunity for in-class performance   | 1 2 3 4 5 NA |
| 18.5 | Instruction presented comprehensive view of subject matter  | 1 2 3 4 5 NA |
| 18.6 | Instruction stimulating in terms of scholarship and intellectual development  | 1 2 3 4 5 NA |
| 18.7 | Classes provided exposure to students of high scholastic and intellectual development   | 1 2 3 4 5 NA |
| 18.8 | Classes provided opportunity for practical application or testing of ideas, methods, or techniques presented  | 1 2 3 4 5 NA |
| 18.9 | Reference materials and library holdings adequate for courses offered   | 1 2 3 4 5 NA |

In considering the following statements, indicate whether you agree or disagree. If the statement is not relevant to your program of study, or if you are unsure about your response, check the space under "Can't Recall."

	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Can't Recall</u>
19.0 Music library was open for sufficient number of hours during the school week to provide adequate access to holdings	_____	_____	_____
20.0 Music library was open for sufficient number of hours during the weekend to provide adequate access to holdings	_____	_____	_____
21.0 Music library facility provided sufficient access to audio/visual aids and equipment	_____	_____	_____
22.0 Music library facility housed quality audio/visual equipment	_____	_____	_____
23.0 As a graduate assistant, music library holdings were sufficiently available to your for in-class use	_____	_____	_____
24.0 Music library provided congenial atmosphere for research and study	_____	_____	_____
25.0 Practice rooms were adequately equipped and conducive to practice	_____	_____	_____
26.0 Practice room instruments provided by the School of Music were well kept, quality instruments	_____	_____	_____



Agree   Disagree   Can't Recall

27.0 Classrooms were adequately  
equipped and conducive to  
learning \_\_\_\_\_

28.0 In your judgment, what is the best description of the overall  
quality of the graduate music faculty during the period of  
your study at LSU?

28.1 Distinguished \_\_\_\_\_  
28.2 Strong \_\_\_\_\_  
28.3 Good \_\_\_\_\_  
28.4 Adequate \_\_\_\_\_  
28.5 Marginal \_\_\_\_\_  
28.6 Not sufficient for  
doctoral training \_\_\_\_\_  
28.7 Insufficient information \_\_\_\_\_

29.0 In your judgement, what is the best description of the overall  
quality of the doctoral program in your area of specialization  
during the period of your study at LSU?

29.1 Distinguished \_\_\_\_\_  
29.2 Strong \_\_\_\_\_  
29.3 Good \_\_\_\_\_  
29.4 Adequate \_\_\_\_\_  
29.5 Marginal \_\_\_\_\_  
29.6 Not sufficient for  
doctoral training \_\_\_\_\_  
29.7 Insufficient information \_\_\_\_\_

The following is a list of curriculum objectives of graduate study in music. Please respond to each objective according to (1) the importance of the objective in your particular program of study at LSU, and (2) the effectiveness of the instruction at LSU in achieving the desired outcome of the objective. Indicate the desired response according to the following rating scales:

Importance of Objective

A - Most important  
B - Very important  
C - Moderately important  
D - Little importance  
E - No importance

Effectiveness of Presentation

A - Most effective  
B - Very effective  
C - Moderately effective  
D - Slightly effective  
E - Not effective

If an objective does not apply to your program of study at LSU, circle "NA" and go on to the next objective. (Note that each objective required two responses, except when "NA" is circled.)

<u>Objective</u>	<u>Importance of Objective</u>	<u>Effectiveness of Presentation at LSU</u>
1. Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the Medieval period in music history	(1) A B C D E	NA (2) A B C D E
2. Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the Renaissance period in music history	(3) A B C D E	NA (4) A B C D E
3. Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the Baroque period in music history	(5) A B C D E	NA (6) A B C D E
4. Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the Classical period in music history	(7) A B C D E	NA (8) A B C D E
5. Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the Romantic period in music history	(9) A B C D E	NA (10) A B C D E
6. Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the Contemporary period in music history	(11) A B C D E	NA (12) A B C D E
7. Ability to recognize and/or create a musical interpretation based in part on sound historical knowledge	(13) A B C D E	NA (14) A B C D E

<u>Objective</u>	<u>Importance of Objective</u>		<u>Effectiveness of Presentation at LSU</u>
8. Ability to perform in public as a soloist	(15) A B C D E	NA	(16) A B C D E
9. Ability to perform in public as a member of an ensemble	(17) A B C D E	NA	(18) A B C D E
10. Ability to be a competent teacher of a least one applied instrument	(19) A B C D E	NA	(20) A B C D E
11. Functional knowledge of various methods or teaching approaches for a major instrument	(21) A B C D E	NA	(22) A B C D E
12. Knowledge of literature and techniques for a major instrument	(23) A B C D E	NA	(24) A B C D E
13. Ability to effectively seek out primary sources of information in preparing a performance	(25) A B C D E	NA	(26) A B C D E
14. Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the Medieval period for a major instrument	(27) A B C D E	NA	(28) A B C D E
15. Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the Renaissance period for a major instrument	(29) A B C D E	NA	(30) A B C D E
16. Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the Baroque period for a major instrument	(31) A B C D E	NA	(32) A B C D E

<u>Objective</u>	<u>Importance of Objective</u>	<u>Effectiveness of Presentation at LSU</u>
17. Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the Classical period for a major instrument	(33) A B C D E	NA (34) A B C D E
18. Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the Romantic period for a major instrument	(35) A B C D E	NA (36) A B C D E
19. Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the Contemporary period for a major instrument	(37) A B C D E	NA (38) A B C D E
20. Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the Medieval period	(39) A B C D E	NA (40) A B C D E
21. Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the 16th century	(41) A B C D E	NA (42) A B C D E
22. Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the 17th century	(43) A B C D E	NA (44) A B C D E
23. Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the 18th century	(45) A B C D E	NA (46) A B C D E
24. Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the 19th century	(47) A B C D E	NA (48) A B C D E

<u>Objective</u>	<u>Importance of Objective</u>	<u>Effectiveness of Presentation at LSU</u>
25. Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the 20th century	(49) A B C D E	NA (50) A B C D E
26. Comprehensive knowledge of the historical foundations of music education	(51) A B C D E	NA (52) A B C D E
27. Comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the philosophical foundations of music education	(53) A B C D E	NA (54) A B C D E
28. Comprehensive knowledge of the sociological foundations of music education	(55) A B C D E	NA (56) A B C D E
29. Comprehensive knowledge of the psychological principles and learning theories as applied to music education	(57) A B C D E	NA (58) A B C D E
30. A functional acquaintance with the research literature in music education with emphasis placed on critical interpretation of research reports and practical application of valid research findings.	(59) A B C D E	NA (60) A B C D E
31. Comprehension of accepted procedures of thesis, dissertation, monograph, journal, and other scholarly writing	(61) A B C D E	NA (62) A B C D E
32. Ability to arrange/edit a composition for vocal solo or ensemble	(63) A B C D E	NA (64) A B C D E
33. Ability to arrange/edit a composition for instrumental solo or ensemble	(65) A B C D E	NA (66) A B C D E

<u>Objective</u>	<u>Importance of Objective</u>	<u>Effectiveness of Presentation at LSU</u>
34. Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the Medieval period	(67) A B C D E NA	(68) A B C D E
35. Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the 16th century	(69) A B C D E NA	(70) A B C D E
36. Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the 17th century	(71) A B C D E NA	(72) A B C D E
37. Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the 18th century	(73) A B C D E NA	(74) A B C D E
38. Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the 19th century	(75) A B C D E NA	(76) A B C D E
39. Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the 20th century	(77) A B C D E NA	(78) A B C D E

PART THREE

## Suggestions for Improvement

In the areas listed below, please state briefly any recommendations which you might have for improvement of the doctoral music program at LSU. If you have no recommendations for improvement, please enumerate the strong points of the area.

ADVISING:

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND COURSE OFFERINGS:

DISSERTATION:

GRADING SYSTEM:

PLACEMENT EXAMINATIONS:



QUALIFYING AND GENERAL EXAMINATIONS:

FINAL EXAMINATION:

PHYSICAL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT:

APPENDIX B

COMMENTS CONCERNING ADVISING

## COMMENTS CONCERNING ADVISING

Responses to:

Advising

(Composition Majors)

1. "Major professor took personal interest - very helpful and supportive."
  2. "Pre-registration appointments of up to one hour per Ph.D. student each semester would prevent oversights and misunderstandings like those which resulted from the five minutes of "advice" I received each semester."
  3. "Good."
  4. "All advisers should know school policy regarding courses. There were errors made in advising which cost me considerable and unnecessary delays."
  5. "I enjoyed extremely good counsel from my adviser. My only suggestion is that the course "Introduction to Research" (I forget the course number) should be categorically required at the beginning of all doctoral course work. Because of scheduling problems, it was one of the two last courses I took. It would have been immensely more helpful if taken first."
  6. "Periodic consulting with student to insure goals and objectives proposed are being met."
  7. "Students should be made keenly aware of vital courses offered in alternate years and those not ordinarily offered in the summer."
  8. "One super-strong professor and the person I most had teachings with both academically and as an advisor, \_\_\_\_\_."
- "Perhaps improvement by showing ways of utilizing of artistic skills in market place."

## Responses to:

Advising

## (Music Education Majors)

1. "My area was good. Planning in advance was encouraged and done together."
2. "Good individual attention given by adviser. Suggestions were helpful, encouraging, and stimulated a desire to continue and persevere through problems with research."
3. "A greater degree of orientation as to the procedures involved in any particular program. Specifically articulated in what exactly is involved before one begins, or is immersed in the intensification of the program or curriculum."
4. "The advising system is very good. The excellence and thoroughness of \_\_\_\_\_ advising made me feel very secure at all times. \_\_\_\_\_ is cognizant of what is to be expected in the Music \_\_\_\_\_ field and did his best to prepare us."
5. "Advising in music education was excellent. Adviser sincerely interested in student and in helping student finish as quickly as possible."
7. "More study in acoustics - tuning - intonation is needed. More listening opportunities (live and recorded). Perhaps bringing in recitalist (or and) ensembles. Also a more definitive entrance exam or audition in order that a student may better understand his potential for success in the program."
8. "Strong in availability of adviser and adviser's genuine concern (music education)."
9. "Most teachers (during my time) were interested in my progress - I especially liked the records that \_\_\_\_\_ kept on each doctoral student so that in case of personnel changes the student would be safe in the progress made."
10. "Purge unqualified students more rapidly. Higher required GRE."
11. "In my case, it was excellent. \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ were always willing and able to advise.

I always felt \_\_\_\_\_ was off-limits unfortunately. He needs contact with the graduate students."

Page two  
Advising  
(Music Education Majors)

12. "Needs to be more time spent with students. Every faculty member needs to agree on what a degree entails before one even starts in the program."
13. "Not always well done. Improper evaluations were made early in the program in regard to qualifications for a performance degree. Jury grades were improperly high. However, when recital was given it was unacceptable. Careful evaluations, faculty communication, and candid grading should be expected in such situations."
14. "Music Education advising was excellent.  
\_\_\_\_\_ is tops!"
15. "I would like to see a closer relationship between adviser and advisee. There needs to be almost an internship with the student absorbing more of the thoughts of the major professor."

## Responses to:

Advising

## (Music History Majors)

1. "Should be on a more personal basis for each individual's specific talents and goals in his degree work. I experienced very little if any real advising (perhaps because I had no real choice of courses to take) but instead took courses as they were offered just to fulfill a degree requirement."
2. "This was excellent at every level. Information was easily available and an open relationship with administration and faculty did away with any hesitancy to ask for assistance."
3. "Recall some discord here, probably administrative, regarding total hours required."
4. "Efficiency of advisement is totally dependent upon the interest of the major professor. In my area there was no problem. I heard of problems in other areas."
5. "I have no recommendations for improvement in this area. Individuals at the doctoral level have relatively little need for advising and what needs they might have are adequately met by LSU's senior faculty."
6. "Strong points: low teacher-student ratio - professors have a chance to become more aware of students individual needs."
7. "Mostly good. No real problems."
8. "My advisers were helpful and consistent."
9. "Centered mostly around my studying the university bulletin carefully."
10. "Give awareness of what Ph.D. (musicology) really entails as a career. What the various options are, e.g., librarianship, publishing, editing, teaching, publications, etc. Give a more broad-based view of field and continue to detail (in courses) with the minutiae."

## Responses to:

Advising

## (Performance Majors)

1. "Adequate."
2. "My professors were extremely adequate and helpful. They too were limited by redundancy and red-tape relating to the Graduate School which the poor music school was subservient to at the time."
3. "Language requirements are essential for all candidates at the doctoral level. This was the greatest weakness of my work at LSU."
4. "Fine. Computer sheets were needed for a more accurate record of courses taken for the adviser. My advisers were familiar with the degree program."
5. "Very good - personal help."
6. "During my tenure there, advising was practically non-existent. My program requirements were lost or misplaced, the adviser made up a program that was somewhat unlike the original. Naturally, this caused much last minute frustrations and hardships.  
  
I don't have the answer to this one. My only suggestion would be to hire the quality of faculty who would respond to a need."
7. "I had excellent advising from my major professor, and the dean was very cooperative and helpful in assisting me cope with the problems of being a long-distance commuter."
8. "Advising was good. I was over-advised by one person who felt I should have taken courses which would help me to be a better department head."
9. "Following my entrance exams I was told of my strong and weak areas. Then I was given in writing a definite list of the courses I would need to take, which was an assurance that I would not be strung along. I appreciated this."
10. "Equal time for all students. Students should have regularly scheduled meetings with their adviser - at least once a month."
11. "Professor was always helpful and available."

Page two  
 Advising  
 (Performance Majors)

12. "My adviser was extremely vague in respect to my course requirements. After my qualifying examination, he merely recommended to my committee that I take a number of courses - listing every course in the catalogue! It was more than a year afterwards before I could pin him down to the specific courses I would need to take in order to satisfy his requirements."
  13. "I had no trouble."
  14. "In advising performance majors, teachers should have an approved list of literature from which a student can choose and plan recitals. New music (involving latest techniques; multiphonics, quarter tones, tape music, etc.) should be on that list and at least one piece on every recital should involve one of these. These kinds of pieces are being programmed all around the country."
  15. "The advising of my monograph research was the strongest, most positive experience of my doctoral work. This job was accomplished in spite of the fact that \_\_\_\_\_ was completely overloaded with advisees! Give him some relief!
- Advising pertaining to voice performance was practically non-existent. What was available was ineffective. The problem lies in the hiring process addressed later . . .
- Theory advising with \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ gets very strong marks. \_\_\_\_\_ was quite helpful in writing my monograph."
16. "My major professor, \_\_\_\_\_, was superb in this aspect. However, as the graduate catalog advises, the student must take responsibility for his own programs and course offerings."



APPENDIX C

COMMENTS CONCERNING COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND COURSE OFFERINGS

## SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Responses to:

Course Requirements and Course Offerings

(Composition Majors)

1. "Allow more opportunity for performance of student compositions, especially 'works in progress' before other composition students with critiques."
2. "Course requirements should be determined to a great extent by major professor and the entire committee - not just the theory and history teachers."
3. "A course in Schenker would seem to be needed in the theory area."
4. "There needs to be more done in the area of electronic music pedagogy and performance."
5. "No quarrel. The courses were very well taught. I particularly appreciated the highly personal concern of my teachers."
6. "A course should be required dealing with the art of music calligraphy. This course should include materials (different pens, pencils, manuscript, ink, etc.) lab work and evaluation, and media similarity and differences."
7. "In musical composition and/or analysis there should be a bit more emphasis on musical form from the 18th century to the present."

Every course that I had was excellent! Overall I cannot speak highly enough of the program!"

8. "Requirements were acceptable.

Because of my excellent background from USC I tested out of most requirements. I was then able to take most all of my courses with \_\_\_\_\_. His courses were superb!"

Responses to:

Course Requirements and Course Offerings

(Music Education Majors)

1. "Balance of history/theory/major area good!  
  
Proficiency and private study in at least 1 performance area should be required.  
  
Many more specific courses in music education needed desperately (and more faculty)."
2. "Course requirements are really fine. Seems at times to lean a bit heavy on history and theory courses, although I personally am glad I had all those courses. I use them in teaching - at least, the information has given me greater insight and background that my colleagues from other schools don't seem to have."
3. "In general, I have found myself to be as well informed in Music Education, History, Theory, Conducting, Woodwinds, as most professors found in other universities. At this point, it is difficult to separate knowledge gained at LSU from that gained elsewhere. However, the program at LSU did kindle an appetite to know more about everything - that is what education is all about."
4. "1) Performance should be mandatory of music education majors.  
  
2) Courses, seminars, etc. should include preschool music very strongly.  
  
3) Courses in administration/management should be included."
5. "(For music education)  
- eliminate language requirement.  
- emphasize more experimental research.  
- reduce history and theory requirements to minimum.  
- increase non-music electives (and music electives)."
6. "1967-'69 = OK then!  
  
I'm not familiar with your present curriculum."
7. "For a person majoring in music education the music history requirements are a bit heavy. Also, I am unsure of the value of a foreign language for the Ph.D."

Page two  
 Requirements and Offerings  
 (Music Education Majors)

There is a need for courses in music education in which students can demonstrate or try out ideas and techniques taught.

More course work in acoustics which is an important area for all musicians and music educators is essential."

8. "Need specialists in advanced choral literature, arranging, etc. Also need specialist in elementary general music - also junior high.

Specific history offerings in choral music and music education."

9. "There should be a limit to the number of term papers that can be assigned during each semester as well as during a course. Often times the only real learning that took place was a result of the research - the professor should have at least some knowledge to impart. At least one professor delayed announcing "if" a term paper would be required until the third or 4th week."
10. "More band arranging and advanced orchestration. Advanced percussion needed."
11. "Ph.D. music education requires no applied music (it may be elected, however) and I find this unfortunate."
12. "Adequate."
13. "Fine in most cases. I would have enjoyed more work in period performance practice."
14. "Need meaningful, required statistics course or courses. Maybe less music history or theory requirements for music education people - take statistics instead?"
15. "At the time I was at LSU, it was required that music education majors had equal course work in history and theory. However, history and theory people did not have to have education. \_\_\_\_\_ liked to think of his education majors as having majored in "music" (the whole scope). Of course I am the winner for it, but at the time I thought it was unfair. Music education majors should be required to pursue an applied instrument."

## Responses to:

Course Requirements and Course Offerings

## (Music History Majors)

1. "D.M.A. requirements don't concentrate enough in specific performance and repertoire areas - too many courses are required which don't relate specifically to a performer's needs. The course in performance practices was completely useless as taught. More effort should be made to offer theory seminars which delve into certain areas with more depth."
2. "Course requirements fell into place well despite some conflicts in course scheduling between music and education schools. The content and selection of required course work met my needs."
3. "Good coverage Renaissance - Contemporary in History-Literature.  
Good coverage Basic Theory Review.  
Confused: Research in Music Literature - c. 1965-67."
4. "Generally good."
5. "Although LSU has an adequate number of period music history courses (i.e., medieval, renaissance, etc.), the music history seminars are exclusively focused on notation courses (with a few exceptions). I would have appreciated a wider variety of seminar topics."
6. "Need more area courses in depth in music history - also seminars and reading courses. This, of course, means more faculty."
7. "Generally strong - would like to see more specific and specialized courses than simply period courses.  
Theory - more separate graduate-level courses."
8. "History area - good. Expand staff for more offerings.  
Theory area - limited, mostly because of inadequate staff (the best theorist, \_\_\_\_\_, was not given tenure, on spurious political grounds). Without \_\_\_\_\_, theory was the weakest area among the faculty.  
Composition - was very good - \_\_\_\_\_ will be sorely missed - offerings in analysis of 20th century works were especially good."

Page two  
Requirements and Offerings  
(Music History Majors)

9. "In literature and history, needed more specific topic courses, rather than era or survey courses. E.g. [sic], add something like 'Study of the Beethoven Quartets,' or 'Study of the Oratorio, Passion, and Cantata.'"
10. "Add courses in literature of various media. Course in preparation of an article/book/dissertation for publication and the research differences that must exist between/among the three. How to, for example, write or present articles for various American (as opposed to) European journals. What are publishers looking for, etc., courses in curriculum now are good. Make composition a requirement."

## Responses to:

Course Requirements and Course Offerings

## (Performance Majors)

1. "Insist on 2 foreign languages.

The D.M.A. Theory and History courses should have been designed on how to teach them at the college level and not to try and become a theorist or historian just to pass the course."

2. "Strengths and concerns:

Too much emphasis on useless theory courses (pre-Renaissance).

All pianists should be required to perform a concerto.

Highly competent faculty who take a personal interest in each candidate.

Some internal friction among faculty was distracting to the otherwise positive thrust of the School of Music.

Those four years at LSU were the high point of my academic preparation. Hard work, faculty encouragement and respect to students, and lots of fun faculty and students contributed to the overall enjoyment of my tenure at LSU."

3. "I felt that there were too many history and literature courses required of performance majors. They were all very useful and beneficial, but too many for the DMA. I also felt that the theory courses could be more varied to include a stronger emphasis on 20th century literature. The 18th through 19th centuries were strong, but the 20th century was weak. A more thorough course in Theory Pedagogy is needed. We covered only McHose, which is obviously not the only approach.

Recitals (number required) should, be standardized. Some gave only two while others were required to present four."

4. "Good - fit requirements to fit individual needs good."

5. "In the DMA more credit needs to go towards performance and ensembles, also composition - in all courses. Standard high quality literature needs to be performed and studied - there should be less paper writing and more practicing of the art of performance and composition - composition should be required of everyone (in traditional styles - no gimmickery)."

Page two  
Requirements and Offerings  
(Performance Majors)

6. "Performance practices should be researched and molded around the needs of the specific student - should have a new approach to vocal literature and vocal repertoire - a performing vocalist should teach both."
7. "(a) I sorely wanted detailed, thorough history courses from Baroque onward. Some were reasonably high calibre but some were abysmal and I resented driving \_\_\_\_\_ to and from \_\_\_\_\_ to attend trivia-time, amidst kids who couldn't have passed undergraduate history to save their souls - and watch us all get A's.  
  
(b) I also wanted some good gusty analysis classes, and they were not available.  
  
(c) I wanted first-rate work in piano and piano literature, and I got exactly that and will always be glad of my LSU degree because of it.  
  
(d) Also a fine research class is there and I valued it greatly."
8. "Good."
9. "It is inevitable that students will have to take courses that will not directly help them in areas they will teach. Meanwhile, we don't always know which things we will teach. Flexibility can be a valuable asset."
10. "More emphasis on performance practices.  
  
More emphasis on interpretation."
11. "It seems to me that all graduate students work in performance should be enrolled in chamber music performance classes. During the period of my doctoral studies I was not required to take a chamber music performance class, nor do I remember one being offered.  
  
The D.M.A. in performance seems to emphasize everything except 'performance.'"
12. "A variety of offerings."



Page three  
 Requirements and Offerings  
 (Performance Majors)

13. "Performance majors need opportunities to perform with artist faculty members. We can learn much and truly need the experience. In my case, I missed the experience of performing literature (chamber) involving strings! This could be part teacher's load!

More opportunities to perform solo concertos with the orchestra should be provided.

At least one lecture recital should be required of the student.

A course in jazz styles, improvising, and a modern theory course should be an elective. Also one on jazz history and one on music business!

A course on how to teach 20th century performance techniques should be offered. I find much theory using chord symbols being used today along with their relation to scales and transposed church modes. This approach is taught at Eastman and other schools and is helpful in the commercial music field. Even amateur guitar students know more of this concept than is taught at LSU.

There are many jobs that require one to be familiar with this style - in fields requiring some jazz experience (in combination with band directors, or applied music).

A course in guitar should be offered as elective."

14. "MORE PERFORMANCE!

Strong - history and theory and research.

Fact - There are no graduate courses in singers diction, opera history, oratorio history, or art songs!

Severe limitations in voice literature, vocal pedagogy, graduate level diction, and performance practice.

Names - \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, and a general incompetence of the voice faculty to come up with strong teachers of any of the vocal courses needed in D.M.A. in voice - This is utterly pathetic and absolutely inexcusable. Combine this fact with the poor relations personally and neurotic personalities and you have an ineffective and demoralizing experience.

Page four  
 Requirements and Offerings  
 (Performance Majors)

The Problem - A - Hiring process  
                   B - Lack of in-process monitoring or feedback system

A - Hiring process

This process is and has been the LSU music school's biggest problem. This is where all the problems begin and take firm root. I am not so naive as to ignore the political and system pressures on this process; and neither am I so blind to the fact that the primary skills and qualifications of hiring a voice teacher are totally ignored. During my stay at LSU (1963-75) there was not one voice teacher hired on the evidence of teaching voice during the interview process. When I was hired at \_\_\_\_\_ over many teachers with "national reputations" and published articles and singing careers, it was because I was their first choice after teaching a series of lessons to various students and demonstrating the ability to diagnose a vocal problem and then address the problem with effective pedagogy! What an obvious consideration! Then, attention needs to be given to personalities which are healthy and compatible with others. Then, students need to give feedback after being taught and after being involved in questions and answer sessions with the candidate. And don't tell me it takes too much time then than to spend it listening to complaints later.

B - Monitoring system

How is it that after years of the following situation prevailing it was never corrected? My only course in graduate voice literature and performance practice (MUS 267) never met the entire year!!!! Even after prodding !!! There was no work done! Only a grade given out of guilt. Unless there is a mechanism by which a free exchange of ideas, suggestions, and complaints can take place, remediation of existing problems is impossible."

15. "OK."

**APPENDIX D**  
**COMMENTS CONCERNING THE DISSERTATION EXPERIENCE**

Responses to:

Dissertation

(Composition Majors)

1. "Composition dissertations should be performed more frequently."
2. "One hour per week of consultation should be scheduled with the major professor throughout the "dissertation in progress" period. This consultation should not have to be a special favor granted only at the convenience of the major professor."
3. "Good."
4. "Excellent advice, criticism and general council throughout. I couldn't ask for more."
5. "Excellent because of \_\_\_\_\_."
6. "I was given broad guidelines which was excellent. \_\_\_\_\_ never put a pencil to my score! Excellent! The approach he used was to ask questions and make general suggestions."
7. "Recent rulings of the copyright law (1976 and revisions) demand intensive investigation of material proposed for use in dissertations."

## Responses to:

Dissertation

(Music Education Majors)

1. "Good advising by all committee members.  
  
Excellent suggestions with critique and help throughout.  
  
Graduate school should read and keep high standards for all dissertations."
2. "Fine job here. My adviser, \_\_\_\_\_, is absolutely terrific as an advisor. He is explicit, to the point, exacting, and extremely fair."
3. "I will be always grateful to \_\_\_\_\_ for the superior training and help in the writing of my dissertation. The experience was very good for me because now I have to help our students with their Master's thesis."
4. "General faculty should have at least a working knowledge of statistics."
5. "Tighten the mechanism for distribution of dissertation through committee.  
  
- music education advisor was extremely cooperative and practical in editing and reviewing manuscript.  
  
- use other style than Turabian."
6. "OK."
7. "More suggestions by faculty for (research) area where study is needed."
8. "Personnel with expertise in several areas needed in order to more adequately guide research."
9. "No comment."
10. "Good."
11. "Comparatively, mine was a breeze. \_\_\_\_\_ is a gem at dissertation guidance."

Page 2  
Dissertation  
(Music Education Majors)

12. "Committee members should each spend time with the student stating his views on what will be accepted and what is expected of the student.
13. "Dissertation guidance was excellent. However, there was some confusion as to who was to be the major professor. I believe procedures were at fault here."
14. "\_\_\_\_\_ of the School of Agriculture came to my rescue in statistics. Some knowledge of statistics would have been helpful."
15. "I enjoyed this. Appreciate the assistance in the area as I wrote no master's thesis."

## Responses to:

Dissertation

## (Music History Majors)

1. "I received as much time and assistance as I requested, very positive and helpful conferences. I was able to work with two professors on the dissertation, and very much appreciated their suggestions in all areas."
2. "The faculty was extremely receptive and flexible toward my research into a field which could have fit several disciplines yet really fit none exactly. All those involved were helpful and encouraging, even through some tight time schedules."
3. "Good guidance, generally."
4. "Dependent upon interest of the major professor and the available resources. Resources at LSU were good but not totally adequate in my area (early American music)."
5. "Although my dissertation director made a sincere effort to help me in my research he was simply too preoccupied with other matters to be of much help. Because the same few individuals tend to be involved in nearly every project committee it seems inevitable that these individuals will suffer a degree of "burn out." In my case, several committee members had evidently read so many papers that semester that they seemed to be in no mood to read mine."
6. "No remarks."
7. "My work with \_\_\_\_\_ was difficult because of distance, but rewarding. I thought this aspect was well handled in spite of trying circumstances."
8. "Too much 'nit-picking' over writing style, and not enough on checking into depth of field coverage and accuracy of intended research."
9. "Proceeded smoothly with no undue delays."
10. "This is a personal situation for each individual. Should be made clear who (on committee) is going to read/grade dissertation; what should focus on, and/or made clear if the work is good or bad quality - give more feedback."

## Responses to:

Dissertation

(Performance Majors)

1. "OK!"
2. "Be certain that advisor and private instructor is also chairman of committee. This will help the student in completing work and will assure that the student doesn't get "caught in the middle" between the private instructor and someone who has no interest whatsoever in fulfilling the obligation of a chairman of the doctoral committee. This will help alleviate the problem of keeping important papers from being uncirculated through proper channels and will also facilitate important matters which should be addressed. When the chairman of a committee and the student's private instructor are not the same, the student inevitably is the one who suffers."
3. "Difficult to say anything about this. The LSU library at the time was not really sufficiently equipped to sustain an in depth study of anything, especially if directed at a specific study of a specific instrument or performance practices."
4. "Definitely worth while."
5. "My monograph was a learning experience! Explicit guidelines should be drawn up for the monograph and the dissertation. (Length, committee size, number of copies required, etc.) Perhaps the disorganization was because it was my chairman's first doctoral project at LSU. I sent copies of each chapter to each committee member (6) and received comments from only four - and some of these were sparse. Consequently, most members read only the final copy and there were problems there that could have been solved in earlier drafts or could have been solved by a more thorough reading by fewer members throughout the rough-draft stage."
6. "Hard work - but necessary for discipline."
7. "Improve your faculty and you'll improve this area."
8. "This was one of the best experiences I had, because of the astounding erudition of my major professor, and because of his unrelenting insistence on obtaining the absolute best I had to give - also because of his many hours of assistance "above and beyond . . ." I appreciated the care and interest of 3 out of



Page 2  
Dissertation  
(Performance Majors)

my 5-man committee. (A 4th seldom even came to my recitals etc.; a 5th was a kindly "yes" man who "loved" all my work, good or bad, and did not take the time to do his job as member of a doctoral committee."

9. "Was rewarding - Well schooled by my advisers."
10. "I have seen too many that are not worthy of the name. A hole needs to be plugged here. Standards should not fluctuate with number of students enrolled."
11. "(Monograph)
  1. Rules and procedures should be specific and clearly outlined.
  2. D.M.A. Monograph should be specifically limited in size and scope. Too often advisers and committees treat monographs like Ph.D. dissertations."
12. "Excellent supervision - good cooperation of committee members - Prompt return of all material submitted for review."
13. "I found the preparation and writing of the monograph pedantic drudgery in light of the fact that the D.M.A. is a performance-oriented degree. The discipline of dissertation/monograph writing in D.M.A. program would best be served by the writing of a research paper as part of a research class. I do not dispute the importance of learning the skills and processes of scholarly writing but I found the experience not worth the effort and expense."
14. "Much closer supervision and consultations are needed with committee and student and student and supervising teacher.

Should a problem arise, steps should be taken immediately to rectify. Deadlines can mean the difference between promotions, raises, and jobs. The faculty should be aware of these problems and try to help more.

More current periodicals for woodwinds are needed to keep up with the latest research in the field.

Speed of getting loans for other libraries should be improved."

Page 3  
Dissertation  
(Performance Majors)

15. "This was an exhilarating experience for me because of the expertise and competence of my adviser, \_\_\_\_\_. The research course gets an A+ and the supervision of the paper gets equally high marks. The only problem was the overload of such cases on his workload and therefore an understandable dilution of his talents.

APPENDIX E  
COMMENTS CONCERNING THE GRADING SYSTEM

Responses to:

Grading System

(Composition Majors)

1. "No recommendations."
2. "Grades in coursework should represent the evaluation of the Ph.D. candidate by the faculty and should match faculty evaluations of General Examinations. A single test should not contradict years of coursework evaluation."
3. "Good."
4. "No worse than anywhere else (I am generally opposed to course-by-course grades on an A-B-C-D-F scale. The 'truth will out' on comprehensive examinations and dissertation.)"
5. "Acceptable."
6. "OK - stiff, but fair. It has to be stiff or excellence will break down within the structure of our system."

Responses to:

Grading System

(Music Education Majors)

1. "Fair.

Doctoral students should be able (and encouraged) to take private lessons on pass/fail and not graded and evaluated like students in that major.

The grading and jury system is a deterrent to private study."

2. "No complaints here. Not from me. I feel that my share of grades for the most part were deserved. I know the A's were deserved."
3. "Overall very fair - However, the standards could be raised."
4. "No problem!"
5. "OK."
6. "OK."
7. "OK."
8. "OK. Perhaps not stringent enough."
9. "Too much weight placed on term paper in several classes - if it is to be that way then say it up front."
10. "Good."
11. "In music theory it sometimes got pretty tough. I'm very proud of my A's under \_\_\_\_\_."
12. "A problem in applied areas. Fine elsewhere."
13. "Adequate."

Responses to:

Grading System

(Music History Majors)

1. "Some professors are openly and obviously partial to certain students - makes for distasteful situation at times."
2. "OK!"
3. "Generally fair and appropriate - Some exceptions could be noted in related courses outside my major field."
4. "Still 4 point equals an A? OK."
5. "In my experience it seems that grading is frequently arbitrary and that expectations are rarely spelled out with any clarity at the beginning of the semester. I must say, however, that errors are nearly always in the student's favor."
6. "No remarks."
7. "OK."
8. "Good and fair."
9. "OK."

## Responses to:

Grading System

(Performance Majors)

1. "No comments."
2. "Acceptable, fair."
3. "Written critiques of recital performances would be helpful. Pass/fail system worked well."
4. "Fine. Very strong requirements and standards."
5. "Good."
6. "LSU is not the only school suffering from grade inflation - yet in many instances the grade inflation rendered meaningless a 4.0 average, since A meant anything from C upward, and B meant barely passing. I'd like it better if grades were more reflective of the truth, and served as a barrier for those who should not have terminal degrees."
7. "Good."
8. "No complaints. We all need to learn to take our knocks."
9. "C grade should be the same as F - No credit."
10. "OK."
11. "D.M.A. recitals should be graded. The main aspect of the performance degree deserves more than 'pass-fail.'"
12. "Fair and helpful."
13. "Good but questionable in music theory - some gray matter exists. More explanation of how evaluated before assignments is needed. Assignments need to be returned sooner (because of the nature of course).
14. "I think that the system itself is fine. I believe it is ludicrous for the entire voice department to grade each person in each jury. The major teacher is the only one who should grade, although the entire voice faculty should hear the student and provide feedback."

**APPENDIX F**  
**COMMENTS CONCERNING PLACEMENT EXAMINATIONS**



Responses to:  
Placement Examinations  
(Composition Majors)

1. "History - very comprehensive."

Theory - include some more challenging examples for harmonic analysis - also some examples for formal analysis (period lengths or small song forms)."

2. "Music theory and history should not be over emphasized."

3. "Good."

4. "OK. I tested out of most history and theory courses.

Students with superior backgrounds should be allowed to do the same!

5. "Fine, but could be a bit more diagnostic. Also, I believe some kind of refereshier history course (outside the basic requirements) would have helped me. I took Music in the Renaissance during one summer and studied intensively for over 40 hours each week just to stay afloat! Some guidance before the course would have helped me get more out of it."

6. "The student should be given an opportunity to state verbally what is not asked for via prepared written examinations. In order to gain more complete assessment of the candidate, final evaluation should be based on what the students know as well as what they do not know."

## Responses to:

Placement Examinations

(Music Education Majors)

1. (Didn't take).
2. "Fairly good. They seemed to pinpoint my own weaknesses and I was able to counter-act in the courses to make up the deficiency in each case."
3. "Excellent - It made me work."
4. "No problems."
5. "Fine and comprehensive!"
6. "OK."
7. "More definitive."
8. "OK."
9. "All seemed to be fair."
10. "I think these need stiffening. Mine were too simple."
11. "Adequate."
12. "The conducting examination was over rated."
13. "Adequate."

Responses to:  
Placement Examinations  
(Music History Majors)

1. "Can't remember much about them, but enjoyed the theory section immensely."
2. "Good."
3. "Seemed quite thorough and produced results that matched my self-evaluations upon entry into the program."
4. "Good (Fall, 1965)."
5. "OK."
6. "These examinations seem to be fair, comprehensive, and adequate for their purpose."
7. "No remarks."
8. "OK - in fact, quite good."
9. "Good and fair."

## Responses to:

Placement Examinations

## (Performance Majors)

1. "Acceptable, fair. I still fail to see the need for 3 types of examinations - placement, qualifying, and finals. Offer 2 chances for the finals and that should be enough."
2. "Thorough and fair."
3. "The theory should be changed. Some of the theory questions were the exact same questions on my entrance examinations - comprehensive, qualifying, and general examinations. This shows the carelessness with which the chairman of that department operates!"
4. "Incoming candidates should be forewarned as to the extent of its comprehensiveness."
5. "The history and literature sections were legitimate indicators of an incoming student's abilities (though biased as so many are in favor of very early music and certain 'pet' areas of the history faculty (pre-Classical and American history, for example). The theory test was a sad indicator of the low level of achievement anticipated of the students - many of my high school students would have passed much of it.

It would please me so much to be able to see LSU become 'distinguished' in quality. It won't, however, if it permits students to matriculate who found that test anything but an easy romp (with the single exception of the writing in 16th century style).

I never was given any 'placement' examinations - only a qualifying examination."

6. "Were thorough."
7. "No complaints. We all need to learn to take our knocks."
8. "Well run and adequate in its intended purpose."
9. "Good."
10. "Thorough."
11. "Very fair and comprehensive."

Page 2  
Placement Examinations  
(Performance Majors)

12. "No complaints."

13. "OK."

APPENDIX G  
COMMENTS CONCERNING QUALIFYING AND GENERAL EXAMINATIONS

Responses to:

Qualifying and General Examinations

(Composition Majors)

1. "Same general comments as above; [sic]  
could use different examinations for different degree programs and areas of concentration."
2. "These examinations should be tailored to the degree program. The major professor should control the general direction of the examination."
3. "OK."
4. "Good."
5. "Well handled. No suggestions for improvement."
6. "OK. There was some evidence shown that the non-compositional members of committee were inferior scholastically, but this may have changed by now."
7. "The student should be given an opportunity to state verbally what is not asked for via prepared written examinations. In order to gain a more complete assessment of the candidate, final evaluation should be based on what the students know as well as what they do not know."

## Responses to:

Qualifying and General Examinations

## (Music Education Majors)

1. "Qualifying should indicate courses of deficiency and show student where weak areas are. Having to take all music education courses (for example), no matter what knowledge one already possesses in certain areas is not "qualifying."
2. "Very exacting and brutally awe-inspiring. They are quite difficult and extremely thorough as a cross-section of the Period Histories."
3. "Great!"
4. "Qualifying examination is superfluous - material in both qualifying and general should be in major subject area.  
  - entirely too much emphasis on music theory and history.
  - placement examination should determine course to be taken rather than general examination (the process of developing a course of study from a very narrow qualifying examination is very bad)."
5. "Qualifying more definitive.  
  - General - less emphasis on music history - more in major area."
6. "Very comprehensive."
7. "Entirely too much writing in such a short period of time - three days - hand began to hurt exceedingly."
8. "Excellent."
9. "I feel the general examination receives more weight than necessary. If a student needs "washing out" the place would be the placement or qualifying examination."
10. "These were not correlated with course study and placement examinations. For example, I was assigned thorough work in theory pedagogy, 16th century counterpoint, and 18th century counterpoint. On my general examination, I was given an analysis problem. Much was made of insufficient ability to analyze. However, no course work in analysis was offered or required. In all



Page 2  
Qualifying and General Examinations  
(Music Education Majors)

theory courses I maintained a high average, however, and passed the general."

11. "I'm glad that since those first days of the program the committee has been reduced in size. At the time I sat through these examinations, the committee consisted of all faculty members with earned doctorates plus one or two without doctorates."
12. "Adequate."
13. "OK."

## Responses to:

Qualifying and General Examinations

## (Music History Majors)

1. "Might be more useful if students are asked to write about knowledge of a broad historical area rather than identify many little-known and basically unimportant facts in the history of music. Studying for the examinations as they were presented brought about knowledge of minute details rather than broad concepts of the music situation in any period in history."
2. "OK."
3. "Provided a high point in my academic career. The discipline required to prepare thoroughly, the exhaustive nature of the examinations themselves, and the good feeling I had at the completion of the examinations themselves were all a verification for me of the quality of the instruction I had received and the comprehensive nature of what had been covered."
4. "Qualifying Examinations (OK as of 1966).  
  
Generals (1968)-Recall shock over extent of Theory Test after some 8 semesters devoted to Music Literature."
5. "These examinations seem to be fair, comprehensive, and adequate for their purpose."
6. "When I was at LSU, there were too many examinations that all did the same thing."
7. "General examinations should be more specialized - and less generalized."
8. "I was not aware until I arrived (from \_\_\_\_\_) that this examination included material from the outside minor, which I had completed 5 years before. Please make this clear to all who take this examination in plenty of time."
9. "Both were fair, good, thorough, and revealing."
10. "Well done. But - in all my years at LSU I never had a listening examination of any sort. This is a serious deficiency."

## Responses to:

Qualifying and General Examinations

## (Performance Majors)

1. "Thorough and well-done."
2. "Thorough, and in my case, extremely fair."
3. "Thorough and fair."
4. "Needs more organization. We had to ask which examination (theory or history) would be given which day. History is very thorough. Very strong! Theory - weaker.  
  
Orals - Okay."
5. "Good."
6. "Faculty should be chosen for general examination who get adequate rest during the night. Snoring and yawning are disturbing on extended answers."
7. "These were identical to qualifying examinations - the history was about the same difficulty, and a fair indicator of a student's level of assimilation. The theory part - God bless it - was easier than the qualifying examination. At that point I was sick to death of being a full time teacher and a full time student, yet studied long and hard. I could have saved my trouble. ("Write intervals above and below given pitches" - Come on! To doctoral students??!)"
8. "Thorough."
9. "No complaints. We all need to learn to take our knocks."
10. "Announcement of just what is expected in these type examinations."
11. "The music history sections of the examinations were as comprehensive for the D.M.A. performance students as they were for the music history majors. Music history examinations should be designed in such a way so that they will be more appropriate to each degree program.

Music theory examinations seem to be appropriate, but it seems the 16th century counterpoint is out of place except on the General Examination for Theory/Composition majors."

Page 2  
Qualifying and General Examinations  
(Performance Majors)

12. "Thorough and fair."
13. "Very fair and comprehensive and they reflect what is being taught especially in the music history courses."
14. "No complaints for the qualifying examinations. The generals in the D.M.A. are top heavy with history and theory and totally lacking in Art Song history, Oratorio and Opera history, Performance Practices, Vocal Pedagogy and Diction. Again, how can it be that the major thrust of the D.M.A. in voice is totally ignored? This question must be addressed!!

Neurotic and vindictive personalities like \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ should not be allowed on doctoral committees, much less the faculty. Ability to communicate in English should be required.

\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_ were reasonably competent, and supportive."

15. "OK."

APPENDIX H  
COMMENTS CONCERNING THE FINAL EXAMINATION

Responses to:  
Final Examination  
(Composition Majors)

1. "No recommendations."
2. "No suggestions."
3. "Good."
4. "Well handled. No suggestions for improvement."
5. "Adequate."
6. "OK."
7. "OK."
8. "All committee members need to read and study the dissertation for meaningful exchange during the "defense" of the dissertation."

## Responses to:

Final Examination

(Music Education Majors)

1. "Fair evaluation of project."
2. "No complaints here. If one has been thoroughly grounded, and has followed the instructions before reaching this point."
3. "30 minutes in duration!"
4. "No problem."
5. "A professor should not be allowed to ask history questions prior to "dissertation defense" (during the same examination period)."
6. "Before the final, the candidate should have a chance to make corrections found by all members of the committee, in order that the little picky stuff like typing errors and mis-spelling may be corrected. Then during the final the committee could devote time to content and refinement."
7. "Adequate."
8. "No basic problem."
9. "Excellent."
10. "A snap - thanks to \_\_\_\_."
11. "Fine - thorough, and justifiably so."
12. "This seemed to be a formality and a time of announcing to the candidate of his elevation to the doctorate level."
13. "Adequate."

## Responses to:

Final Examination

## (Music History Majors)

1. "My final examination consisted mainly of defense of the dissertation as an examination at this point in the degree should. The general mood was congenial and relaxed, although I was tense because of the uncertainty of what I would be asked. It might have helped me if my major professor had given more of an idea on how to approach the final examination as to preparation, what to expect, etc."
2. "I appreciated the fact that this examination seemed somewhat unneeded because of the frequent types of evaluation that had taken place up until this point in time. The examination took on more of a nature of a congratulatory meeting in which best wishes were expressed by all those with whom I had worked for three years."
3. "Fine Board (Vocal - Keyboard - Theory - Education) as well as History/Literature. Minimum of administrative "hitches" between Music and Graduate Schools."
4. "OK."
5. "These examinations seem to be fair, comprehensive, and adequate for their purpose."
6. "No remarks."
7. "Stern but fair. Very good."
8. "Fair and balanced. Some argumentation on re-writing certain passages. Doctoral minor field adviser was present, although no one was aware he would ask questions. There was the opinion that a doctoral minor might not be essential in the future - post 1967."
9. "Again, more personal than general, but I felt that all the work done in dissertation was more than committee wanted to get into. Also, would have appreciated an overall evaluation of paper - as compared to other similar dissertations."



## Responses to:

Final Examination

## (Performance Majors)

1. "Professional."
2. "Thorough and in my case, extremely fair."
3. "Thorough and fair to me. I did observe from colleagues that some faculty abused students by using these occasions to counter-act the work of major professor whose teaching approach was different from their approach."
4. "More could be done to eliminate the last-minute hassle by having each committee submit written comments with specific page numbers, line numbers, etc. TOO NIT-PICKY!"
5. "Excellent - made you think."
6. "Questions should be limited to dissertation."
7. "This was a pretty 'pro forma' thing - an opportunity for committee members to express their agreement or disagreement with aspects of the document. I was relieved to have so pressure-free a situation, and was appreciative of some excellent ideas from 3 of them who improved my paper. I have omitted names so far, but wish to praise these 3 for their care and time, and the professionalism with which they approached their responsibility - \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_. Because of them the final was a productive experience."
8. "Comprehensive."
9. "I was surprised at how brief this process was. One is not thoroughly examined in all areas. It is somewhat of a spot-check. Perhaps this is enough, I'm not sure."
10. "Ask questions that you believe the student can or should be able to answer."
11. "Limit the number of committee members to a reasonable size - perhaps three. If my memory serves correctly, there were more than seven faculty invited to my final examination. Some were not even sure why they were there!"

Page 2  
Final Examination  
(Performance Majors)

12. "I found all examinations to be sufficiently demanding and fair in all respects."
13. "There should be no surprises on this examination - only what you expect the candidate to know."
14. "No complaints except for \_\_\_\_\_ who, when asked by the committee chairman to ask questions on my paper, responded with, "What is the difference in a man and a woman [sic]." That should speak for itself."
15. "OK."

APPENDIX I  
COMMENTS CONCERNING PHYSICAL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

## Responses to:

Physical Facilities and Equipment

## (Composition Majors)

1. "Need better acoustical isolation for classrooms and practice rooms."
2. "Much remodeling is needed along with additional practice room and classroom space. Most of the equipment is overdue to be replaced."
3. "More listening in music library."
4. "The pianos in the practice rooms were, for the most part, terribly out of condition. At least one VCR would be invaluable in faculty and student evaluation of classroom performance by both faculty and students."
5. "Good. I only hope the synthesizer has found a "new home" and that it is working properly. The keyboard was malfunctioning when I took the course."
6. "OK."
7. "Need equipment in the area of Acoustics to measure instrument and voice timbre, formant, calibration, overtone prominence, etc."

## Responses to:

Physical Facilities and Equipment

## (Music Education Majors)

1. "Adequate.

(All) Music library and recording etc. would be more helpful if in same housing.

Graduate lounge or student lounge needed.

(Real)! Offices for graduate assistants needed - Not a faculty coffee lounge! To meet and help students there without privacy is not adequate."

2. "Poorest area. Music equipment needed. Area is a prime requisite. Not enough floor space for the various activities such as orchestra, choral works, class rooms, practice rooms. More library space for the School of Music library."
3. "In spite of the horrible physical facilities, I love LSU and I learned a great deal there from some very professional and wonderful teachers."
4. "No problem."
5. "Needs expansion with more and new equipment and instruments. More ensemble rehearsal areas needed."
6. "More practice rooms.  
  
Better audio/visual equipment.  
  
Expand music library."
7. "More practice space.  
  
Larger room needed for elementary education teaching (Ed. 2170) in order to allow flexibility in movement. Strong in Orff instruments.  
  
More audio/visual equipment in library."
8. "LSU Music School was in need of upgraded physical facilities - more practice rooms."

Page two  
Physical Facilities and Equipment  
(Music Education Majors)

9. "Fair to poor.  
  
New facility needed badly. Present facility is a disgrace to this fine institution."
10. "Generally inferior - at least in the mid-70's."
11. "Very inadequate and not conducive to practice or study. Not enough practice rooms."
12. "What was available was effectively used. Performance facilities and rehearsal rooms were very inadequate, however. Music library was not always helpful, because organization and correlation of holdings between music library and main library were ineffective."
13. "Adequate."
14. "Need rooms for small seminars."

## Responses to:

Physical Facilities and Equipment

## (Music History Majors)

1. "Building too small for all students and activities; practice facilities inadequate."
2. "Classrooms - good.  
  
Faculty office space - sadly lacking in size and number for the types of work and conferences required in the program.  
  
Practice rooms - inadequate in number and quality, so much so that I made it a point to do all my practicing at home.  
  
Equipment for classes was good - for overall student use seemed rundown."
3. "Circa 1965-68 'Adequate' - needed recital stage separate from Speech/Union Theater."
4. "OK."
5. "Although LSU's library is probably relatively large in comparison to other similar institutions, I think that serious students of music history would do well to consider institutions with still better resources (such as Illinois, North Texas, etc.)."
6. "Could be improved. The collegium needs more instruments. It should be a laboratory for the Music History students."
7. "I feel that there is room for improvement, but I believe that the administration is working in this direction."
8. "For my purposes, adequate."
9. "1. Needed more musicological research aids - quarterlies, Denkmaler, etc.  
  
2. A new pipe organ."
10. "Excellent. Library is one of the best. More practice rooms - but everyone knows that."

## Responses to:

Physical Facilities and Equipment

## (Performance Majors)

1. "Always not enough for students, but the LSU School of Music is not to blame - they are properly monitored and are adequate and available for student and faculty use."
2. "Pitiful! Hours were wasted waiting for practice rooms only to be greeted by an 88-key monster that came to America on the Mayflower!

Hopefully this situation has improved."

3. "Needs much improvement. New practice pianos, turntables and other such equipment, more pleasant surroundings. The recital facilities were not good. We gave recitals off campus due to the lack of a concert instrument. I understand that some changes are being made - which is good.

The music library was, perhaps, the weakest of all aspects. Classrooms, etc. need much to compete with other graduate schools."

4. "Sometimes there were not enough rooms available to practice."
5. "In much need of complete replacement."
6. "Library holdings were most satisfactory, practice facilities totally inadequate. Even studio pianos were awful, though this has been remedied to some extent since I graduated."
7. "Good."
8. "As long as they are at least fairly adequate, no one's education will suffer."
9. "More tape recorders for faculty studies."
10. "More practice rooms needed. Carrels needed in Music Building for doctoral students."
11. "LSU desperately needs:
  1. many more practice rooms.
  2. a bonafide concert hall.
  3. many more teaching studios."



Page 2  
Physical Facilities and Equipment  
(Performance Majors)

12. "Certainly needs improvement - especially performance facilities (i.e., practice studios)."
13. "Inadequate."
14. "Audition tapes for performance majors should be a priority. Therefore first rate equipment and a trained engineer should be provided. Many times a job may depend on the quality of the tape. Since this is a primary goal of most students, more help should be provided in this area.

This is really my greatest criticism - along with the lack of opportunities to perform with artist faculty."

15. "New building???"
16. "OK."

APPENDIX J  
MISCELLANEOUS COMMENTS

Responses to:

Miscellaneous Responses

(Composition Majors)

1. "Since I came into the LSU graduate school with some 20 graduate hours from Indiana University and Eastman as well as 6 years collegiate teaching experience, 15 years of private teaching and a year or so of professional orchestra playing, my relationship with LSU was extremely tangential. I am really totally unfamiliar with comparative data which would make my comments on Part Three useless.

My course work was negotiated from my General Examination [sic] which I would say was appropriate for any graduate music program. I was successful in fighting for, and receiving a fair course-work program. How that program compared with any others, I have no idea . . . my work toward the degree was mine and mine alone. The 4 or 5 classes I took were helpful and of adequate graduate level . . . but nothing which could not have been learned alone.

The oral examinations seemed generally appropriate - but some professors (as is usually the case anywhere) tended to get excessively "picky" in irrelevant areas just for the sake of intimidation. Hopefully, this has been modified. (However, I doubt it . . . alas, human nature)."

## Responses to:

Miscellaneous Responses

## (Music Education Majors)

1. "One teacher was habitually late for class - ill prepared - moody and had little for most students. Had one been a complete discipline of the Goetches book on form perhaps some relevance to his teaching could be considered. His personal problems, slovenly dress, and demeaning attitude left much to be desired as a faculty member. The fact that this individual was actually awarded the outstanding faculty member award left a somewhat bitter taste in my mouth (as you can tell).

The most critical aspect that I can say about my time in the LSU doctoral program is that the real vitality of what music is about was missing - in the music as well as in the teaching - music was an exercise - very few of the teachers ever really got excited about music. There was a reluctance on the part of a few of the teachers to discuss differing points of controversy - even on a limited scale. I am also sorry to say that due to the over emphasis on Music History and Theory - Music Education had to take a back seat."

## Responses to:

Miscellaneous Responses

## (Music History Majors)

1. "As you may gather from my comments, I have a most favorable impression about my doctoral study at LSU. The three years spent there still rank as one of the most enjoyable periods of my adult life. The professional calibre of the faculty along with a warm open approach to each student as a person brought about my best efforts and a most pleasant overall experience. As a result I have tried to encouraged my students to consider LSU as a possible place for graduate study. I continue to maintain contact with \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_. In addition, I have grown to appreciate greatly the efforts of \_\_\_\_\_ in the placement office."
2. "I am happy to have been an LSU graduate student for 5 years. It was well worth my time."

## Responses to:

## Miscellaneous Responses

## (Performance Majors)

1. "Several faculty at LSU are among the top teachers in the nation. They have not, however, had the exposure that they deserve. Every effort should be made to place them in adjudicator positions, have them published, or advertise them on a national scale. Students want to come to a school where they know of a particular teacher. It has been difficult, even with a strong personal recommendation, to convince them and their families to send them to a school with teachers that they do not know of or know."
  2. "An honest evaluation requires a hard look at the cold facts as I have endeavored to provide them. Now that I have filled out this form, I would like to offer one more overall consideration. The most important ingredient and catalyst for a successful doctoral program is leadership that combines vision with reality, courage with compassion, discipline with flexibility, orientation with detail, and a shared, spirited morale with a joy for the mundane. A leader must have the courage to make some hard decisions pertaining to hiring and retooling, if necessary, of existing faculty, because the faculty is, by definition, the doctoral program.
- I am very grateful and happy about my LSU education. I love LSU and Baton Rouge very much. If ever I can assist in providing more help for the School of Music, do not hesitate to let me know."

APPENDIX K  
OBJECTIVES OF GRADUATE STUDY ACCORDING TO  
RESPONSE TYPE

## Type I Response

Objective - Most important

Instruction - Very effective

1. Ability to perform in public as a soloist.
2. Knowledge of literature and techniques for a major instrument.
3. Ability to effectively seek out primary sources of information in preparing a performance.
4. Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the Romantic period for a major instrument.
5. Comprehension of accepted procedures of thesis, dissertation, monograph, journal, and other scholarly writing



## Type II Response

Objective - Very important

Instruction - Very effective

1. Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the Renaissance period in music history.
2. Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the Baroque period in music history.
3. Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the Classical period in music history.
4. Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the Romantic period in music history.
5. Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the Contemporary period in music history.
6. Ability to recognize and/or create a musical interpretation based in part on sound historical knowledge.
7. Ability to perform in public as a member of an ensemble.
8. Ability to be a competent teacher of at least one applied instrument.
9. Functional knowledge of various methods or teaching approaches for a major instrument.
10. Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the Baroque period for a major instrument.
11. Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the Classical period for a major instrument.
12. Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the Romantic period for a major instrument.
13. Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the Contemporary period for a major instrument.
14. Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the 16th century.
15. Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the 17th century.

16. Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the 18th century.
17. Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the 19th century.
18. Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the 20th century.
19. Comprehensive knowledge of the historical foundations of music education.
20. Comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the philosophical foundations of music education.
21. Comprehensive knowledge of the psychological principles and learning theories as applied to music education.
22. A functional acquaintance with the research literature in music education with emphasis placed on critical interpretation of research reports and practical application of valid research findings.
23. Ability to arrange/edit a composition for vocal solo or ensemble.
24. Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the 16th century.
25. Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the 17th century.
26. Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the 18th century.
27. Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the 19th century.
28. Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the 20th century.

## Type III Response

Objective - Very important

Instruction - Moderately effective

1. Comprehensive knowledge of the sociological foundations of music education.
2. Ability to arrange/edit a composition for instrumental solo or ensemble.

## Type IV Response

Objective - Moderately important    Instruction - Moderately effective

1. Knowledge of and technical command of a repertoire of music literature of the Medieval period for a major instrument.
2. Knowledge of music theorists and approaches to theory of the Medieval period.
3. Ability to create a composition based on the compositional techniques and devices of the Medieval period.

## Type V Response

Objective - Moderately important    Instruction - Very effective

1. Knowledge of persons, performance practice, and music of the Medieval period in music history.

APPENDIX L  
ORGANIZATIONS IN WHICH LSU DOCTORAL  
GRADUATES HOLD MEMBERSHIP

Organizations in Which LSU Doctoral  
Graduates Hold Membership

1. American Choral Directors Association
2. American Guild of Organists
3. American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers
4. American Association of University Professors
5. American Federation of Musicians
6. American Musicological Society
7. American Orff-Schulwerke Association
8. American String Teachers Association
9. College Band Directors National Association
10. College Music Society
11. International Clarinet Society
12. Music Educators National Conference
13. Music Teachers National Association
14. National Association of College Wind and Percussion Instructors
15. National Association of Teachers of Singing
16. National Continuing Education Association
17. National Federation of Music Clubs
18. National Guild of Piano Teachers
19. National Opera Association
20. National Saxophone Alliance

## VITA

Donzell Lee was born January 6, 1950 in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. He attended the public schools in Pine Bluff, and received the high school diploma in May 1968.

Mr. Lee studied piano at Xavier University, New Orleans, Louisiana, from 1968 to 1972. In May 1972, he was awarded the Bachelor of Music degree.

From 1972 to 1974, Mr. Lee studied piano with Professor Adolf Baller at Stanford University, in Palo Alto, California. He received the A.M. degree in performance practice in January 1974.

In September 1974, Mr. Lee accepted a position on the music faculty at Alcorn State University, Lorman, Mississippi. At Alcorn State Mr. Lee taught class piano, applied piano, fundamentals of music, and music appreciation. In May 1978, Mr. Lee was granted a leave of absence from Alcorn State in order to begin work toward the Ph.D. degree in music education.



## EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: Donzell Lee

Major Field: Music Education

Title of Thesis: An Evaluation of the Louisiana State University School of Music  
Doctoral Degree Program: A Follow-Up Study of its Doctoral  
Graduates

Approved:

Robert Shambaugh  
Major Professor and Chairman

Seán P. McGlynn  
Dean of the Graduate School

### EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Hallace McKenzie

Paul Louis Abel

John R. Ramey

Lyle Merriam

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Date of Examination:

\_\_\_\_\_

30 October 1981

\_\_\_\_\_